

Mr. SMITH of Washington: Committee on Indian Affairs. S. 2830. An act to provide relief to the owners of former Indian-owned land within the Oroville-Tonasket irrigation district, Washington, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2734). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BLAND: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 7105. A bill to provide for the suspension, during the war, of operating-differential subsidy agreements, and attendant benefits, under title VI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2735). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Committee on the Territories. H. R. 5948. A bill to amend the Hawaiian Organic Act so as to provide for reapportionment of the membership of the House of Representatives of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii and to create districts from which said representatives shall be elected, and to authorize the said legislature to provide for reapportionment within each county of the membership of the senate of said legislature and to create districts from which said senators shall be elected; with amendment (Rept. No. 2736). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Committee on the Territories. H. R. 6461. A bill to authorize the incorporated city of Anchorage, Alaska, to purchase and improve the electric light and power system of the Anchorage Light & Power Co., Inc., an Alaska corporation, and for such purpose to issue bonds in the sum of not to exceed \$1,250,000 in excess of present statutory debt limits; without amendment (Rept. No. 2737). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BLAND: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 7744. A bill to provide that employees of the United States, its Territories or possessions, or of the District of Columbia who leave their positions to serve in the merchant marine shall be restored to their positions upon the termination of such service; with amendment (Rept. No. 2738). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LEA:

H. R. 7863. A bill for the relief of the State of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 7864. A bill to amend the act of September 22, 1941, Public Law 252, Seventy-seventh Congress, with relation to the temporary appointments of officers in the Army of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. J. Res. 369. Joint resolution authorizing the printing and binding of 1,500 copies of a revision of Cannon's Procedure in the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Printing.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL introduced a bill (H. R. 7865) for the relief of Peter Cuccio and Jasper and Pauline Cuccio (minors), which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3489. By Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Resolution adopted by Story County, Iowa, Bankers As-

sociation, dated November 18, 1942, protesting against Production Credit Association lending; to the Committee on Agriculture.

3490. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Petition of the Wisconsin Cannery Association, Madison, Wis.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3491. By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa: Petition of Ruth A. Levendahl, secretary, student branch, American Pharmaceutical Association, College of Pharmacy, University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa, and fellow students, urging the passage of House bill 7432 and Senate bill 2690 to establish a Pharmacy Corps in the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3492. By Mr. MERRITT: Resolution of the Queens County Board, Ancient Order of Hibernians, affirming its appreciation of the confidence reposed in William Griffin on occasions by our beloved President of the United States and by many distinguished citizens of the United States of various racial and religious origins and affiliations, and expressing its sincere belief that the said William Griffin is devoted to our United States Constitution and our American ideals; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3493. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Springfield Chamber of Commerce, Springfield, Mo., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the death of Hon. Phil A. Bennett; to the Committee on Memorials.

3494. Also, petition of the Acting Secretary of the Interior, petitioning consideration of resolution dated July 24, 1942; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## SENATE

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 15, 1942

(Legislative day of Monday, November 30, 1942)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God of all Grace and Love, trusting only in Thy mercy would we seek Thy face. We come asking not that Thy will be bent to our whim but that Thy completeness flow around our incompleteness, and around our restlessness Thy rest.

May the Christmas Cradle bring to us a penitent revelation of our towering self-sufficiency and the realization that in our smart sophistication we have so often mistaken knowledge for truth and cleverness for wisdom; and so, alas, have trusted in a wisdom that is not wise. May the Christmas skies and song shed new wonder and mystic meaning on tasks as commonplace as that of shepherds watching their flocks by night. And may the Christmas climate, with its balmy breezes of good will, melt cold unbrotherliness, touching the bleak and barren areas of unbelief into the blossomed loveliness of a spiritual springtime. In that sunny domain unmarred by the blighting frost of disillusionment and intolerance may there bloom the fragrant flowers of humility and sweet charity.

We ask it in the ever blessed Name of that One at whose birth the angels sang and wise men hastened, and of whom the holy prophets declared, "And the gov-

ernment shall be upon His shoulder." Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, December 11, 1942, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On December 11, 1942:

S. 2292. An act for the relief of Fred Walker, Sr., legal guardian for Fred Walker, Jr.; the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia; and

S. 2742. An act for the relief of Guy E. Mish.

On December 12, 1942:

S. 2195. An act for the relief of Charles E. Salmons.

On December 14, 1942:

S. 2268. An act to further amend section 126 of the act of June 3, 1916, as amended, to authorize travel pay for certain military and naval personnel on discharge or release or relief from active duty;

S. 2422. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to designate the titles of certain offices and departments of instruction at the United States Military Academy;

S. 2619. An act to amend Article of War 114 so as to broaden the power to administer oaths and take acknowledgments;

S. 2891. An act to amend paragraph 8, section 127a, of the National Defense Act so as to authorize certain service to be counted in determining precedence among officers when dates of rank are the same; and

S. 2867. An act to provide for the appointment of an additional circuit judge for the fifth circuit.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 140) granting permission to Hugh S. Cumming, Surgeon General (retired) of the United States Public Health Service, to accept certain decorations bestowed upon him by the Republics of Colombia, Haiti, and Chile.

The message also announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 4918. An act for the relief of Anna J. Krogoli;

H. R. 7357. An act for the relief of Madeleine Flori;

H. R. 7522. An act to amend the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1943, so as to authorize the use of public-school buildings in the District of Columbia as and for day nurseries and nursery schools, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 7587. An act for the relief of Etta A. Thompson, Marion E. Graham, Irene Morgan, and Alice K. Weber.

The message further announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 5486. An act to provide for means of egress for buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5812. An act for the relief of William E. Averitt and United States Casualty Co;

H. R. 6839. An act relating to the appointment and retirement in the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve of persons with physical disabilities, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 7633. An act to increase the pay and allowances of members of the Army Nurse Corps, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 7514. An act to authorize payment by the departments and agencies of the United States, notwithstanding section 89 of the act of April 30, 1900 (31 Stat. 141), for the use, during a limited period, of certain wharves of the Territory of Hawaii;

H. R. 7828. An act for the relief of John Sweeney;

H. R. 7841. An act relating to the administration of grazing districts; and

H. J. Res. 368. Joint resolution fixing the date of meeting of the first session of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to Senate Concurrent Resolution 40, as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring).* That the Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed, in the enrollment of the bill (S. 2528) to provide for the settlement of certain claims of the Government of the United States on behalf of American nationals against the Government of Mexico, to strike out the words "section 6 (b)" where they appear in section 8 (c) thereof and insert in lieu thereof the words "sections 4 (b), 4 (c), and 6 (b)."

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 1666. An act to coordinate Federal reporting services, to eliminate duplication and reduce the cost of such services, and to minimize the burdens of furnishing information to Federal agencies;

S. 2341. An act to amend the act approved March 14, 1936, entitled "An act to provide for vacations for government employees, and for other purposes";

S. 2353. An act to amend sections 1305 and 1306 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to eliminate the prohibition against payment of deposits, and interest thereon, of enlisted men until final discharge;

S. 2528. An act to provide for the settlement of certain claims of the Government of the United States on behalf of American nationals against the Government of Mexico;

S. 2769. An act to authorize the rank of rear admiral in the Dental Corps of the United States Navy;

S. 2852. An act to authorize the President to confer decorations and medals upon units of, or persons serving with, the military forces of cobelligerent nations;

S. 2889. An act to further the war effort by authorizing the substitution of other materials for strategic metals used in minor coinage, to authorize the forming of worn and uncurrent standard silver dollars into bars, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 7575. An act to expedite the prosecution of war, and for other purposes.

#### HOUSE BILLS REFERRED OR PLACED ON CALENDAR

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred or ordered to be placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H. R. 7514. An act to authorize payment by the departments and agencies of the United

States, notwithstanding section 89 of the act of April 30, 1900 (31 Stat. 141), for the use, during a limited period, of certain wharves of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs;

H. R. 7828. An act for the relief of John Sweeney; and

H. R. 7841. An act relating to the administration of grazing districts; to the calendar.

#### JUDGE OF UNITED STATES CUSTOMS COURT—NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, the Committee on the Judiciary has received the nomination of Charles D. Lawrence, of New York, to be judge of the United States Customs Court.

As chairman of the subcommittee appointed to consider this nomination and as required by a rule of the committee, I announce that Tuesday, December 22, 1942, at 10:30 a. m., has been set for a hearing in the Judiciary Committee room on this nomination. At this time and place all interested parties may be heard.

#### DISTRICT JUDGE OF HAWAII—NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, the Committee on the Judiciary has received the nomination of J. Frank McLaughlin, of Hawaii, to be judge of district of Hawaii.

As chairman of the subcommittee appointed to consider this nomination and as required by a rule of the committee, I announce that Tuesday, December 22, 1942, at 10:30 a. m., has been set for a hearing in the Judiciary Committee room on this nomination. At that time and place all interested parties may be heard.

#### JUDGE OF THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA—NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, the Committee on the Judiciary has received the nomination of Stephen S. Chandler, Jr., of Oklahoma, to be judge of the district court for the western district of Oklahoma.

As chairman of the subcommittee appointed to consider this nomination and as required by a rule of the committee, I announce that Tuesday, December 22, 1942, at 10:30 a. m., has been set as the time for a hearing in the Judiciary Committee room on this nomination. At that time and place all interested parties may be heard.

#### CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Danaher	McCarran
Andrews	Davis	McFarland
Austin	Downey	McNary
Bailey	Doxey	Maloney
Barkley	Gerry	Maybank
Bone	Gillette	Mead
Brewster	Green	Millikin
Brooks	Guffey	Murdock
Brown	Gurney	Murray
Bulow	Herring	Nelson
Burton	Hill	Norris
Butler	Johnson, Calif.	Nye
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	O'Daniel
Capper	Kilgore	Pepper
Caraway	Langer	Radcliffe
Clark, Idaho	Lodge	Reed
Clark, Mo.	Lucas	Schwartz

Scrugham	Thomas, Okla.	Wallgren
Shipstead	Truman	Walsh
Shott	Tunnell	Wheeler
Spencer	Tydings	White
Stewart	Vandenberg	Wiley
Taft	Van Nuys	
Thomas, Idaho	Wagner	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is detained because of a slight cold.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] is out of the city on important public business.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senators from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER and Mr. OVERTON], the Senators from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE and Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HUGHES], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. LEE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are necessarily absent.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] are necessarily absent.

My colleague the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN] is absent on public business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

#### CREDENTIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the credentials of JAMES E. MURRAY, duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Montana a Senator from that State for the term beginning January 3, 1943, which were read and ordered to be filed, as follows:

*In the Name and by the Authority of the State of Montana, To All Whom These Presents Shall Come, Greeting:*

Know ye, That I, Sam C. Ford, Governor of the State of Montana, do hereby certify that at a general election held in the State of Montana on the 3d day of November A. D. 1942, pursuant to section 531 of the Revised Codes of the said State, JAMES E. MURRAY was duly elected to the office of United States Senator in and for the State of Montana, he having received the highest number of votes for said office as appears from a certified copy of the abstract votes cast at said election now on file in my office.

And by virtue of the power vested in me by the Constitution, and in pursuance of the laws, I do hereby commission him, the said JAMES E. MURRAY, to be United States Senator, hereby authorizing and empowering him to execute and discharge, all and singular, the duties appertaining to said office, and enjoy all the privileges and immunities thereof for a period of 6 years, beginning January 3, 1943.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto subscribed my hand and caused the great seal of the State of Montana to be affixed at



Helena, Mont., the 9th day of December, in the year of our Lord, 1942, and in the one hundred and sixty-seventh year of the independence of the United States.

SAM C. FORD.

By the Governor:  
[SEAL]

SAM W. MITCHELL,  
Secretary of State.

Mr. GILLETTE presented the credentials of GEORGE A. WILSON, duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Iowa a Senator from that State for the term beginning January 3, 1943, which were read and ordered to be filed, as follows:

STATE OF IOWA,  
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 3d day of November 1942 GEORGE A. WILSON was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Iowa a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1943.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor, George A. Wilson, and our seal hereto affixed at Des Moines, this 28th day of November, in the year of our Lord 1942.

GEO. A. WILSON.

By the Governor:  
[SEAL]

EARL G. MILLER,  
Secretary of State.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma presented the credentials of EDWARD H. MOORE, duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Oklahoma a Senator from that State for the term beginning January 3, 1943, which were read and ordered to be filed, as follows:

STATE OF OKLAHOMA,  
EXECUTIVE CHAMBER,

Oklahoma City, December 7, 1942.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 3d day of November 1942 EDWARD H. MOORE, of Tulsa, Okla., was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Oklahoma a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1943.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor Leon C. Phillips, and our seal hereto affixed at Oklahoma City, Okla., this 7th day of December, in the year of our Lord 1942.

By the Governor of the State of Oklahoma.  
LEON C. PHILLIPS.

Attest:  
[SEAL]

C. C. CHILDERS,  
Secretary of State.

Mrs. CARAWAY presented the credentials of JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Arkansas a Senator from that State for the term beginning January 3, 1943, which were read and ordered to be filed, as follows:

STATE OF ARKANSAS,  
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,  
Little Rock.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 3d day of November, 1942, JOHN L. MCCLELLAN was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Arkansas a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January, 1943.

In testimony thereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused to be affixed the great

seal of the State in the Governor's office at Little Rock, on this 3d day of December 1942.

HOMER M. ADKINS,  
Governor.

By the Governor:  
[SEAL]

C. G. HALL,  
Secretary of State.

Mr. WALSH presented the credentials of HENRY CABOT LODGE, Jr., duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Massachusetts a Senator from that State for the term beginning January 3, 1943, which were read and ordered to be filed, as follows:

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS  
TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 3d day of November 1942 HENRY CABOT LODGE, Jr., was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts a Senator from said Commonwealth to represent said Commonwealth in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January, 1943.

Witness: His Excellency our Governor Leverett Saltonstall, and our seal hereto affixed at Boston this 9th day of December, in the year of our Lord 1942.

LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,  
Governor.

By the Governor:  
[SEAL]

F. W. COOK,  
Secretary of State.

Mr. KILGORE presented the credentials of CHAPMAN REVERCOMB, duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of West Virginia a Senator from that State for the term beginning January 3, 1943, which were read and ordered to be filed, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATOR—A PROCLAMATION BY  
THE GOVERNOR

Whereas, it appears by the certificates returned by the Commissioners of the County Courts (who are ex-officio the Boards of Canvassers) of the several counties composing the State of West Virginia, that at the general election held on the 3d day of November 1942, Matthew M. Neely received two hundred seven thousand forty-five (207,045) votes, and CHAPMAN REVERCOMB received two hundred fifty-six thousand eight hundred sixteen (256,816) votes:

Therefore, I, Matthew M. Neely, Governor of the State of West Virginia, do by this my proclamation declare that CHAPMAN REVERCOMB, of Charleston, in the county of Kanawha, having received the largest number of votes cast at the said election, is duly elected United States Senator for the 6-year term beginning January 3, 1943.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the great seal of the State to be affixed.

Done at the Capitol in the City of Charleston, this 1st day of December in the year of our Lord, 1942, and of the State the 80th.

MATTHEW M. NEELY,  
Governor.

By the Governor:  
[SEAL]

WILLIAM S. O'BRIEN,  
Secretary of State.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE  
PRODUCTION, TRANSPORTATION, AND  
USE OF FUELS IN AREAS WEST OF THE  
MISSISSIPPI RIVER

Under the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to subsequently today, the Vice President appointed Mr. CLARK of Missouri, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. STEWART, Mr. REED, and Mr. GURNEY members of the Special Committee to Investigate the

Production, Transportation, and Use of Fuels in Certain Areas West of the Mississippi River.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF THE CHAIRMAN OF THE WAR PRODUCTION BOARD RELATING TO SMALLER BUSINESS ENTERPRISES

A letter from the Chairman of the War Production Board, submitting, pursuant to law, his third report of operations under the terms of Public Law 673, 77th Congress, relating to smaller business enterprises; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, lists of papers and documents on the files of the Departments of the Navy, Interior, and Agriculture; the Federal Works Agency, and the Federal Power Commission which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a resolution of the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, V. I., favoring the enactment of legislation to authorize the deposits of all internal-revenue collections on liquors and articles produced in the Virgin Islands and transported into the United States, to accrue intact and to be paid into the municipal treasury of that municipality of the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by Local No. 33, International Fishermen and Allied Workers of America (affiliated with the C. I. O.), of San Pedro, Calif., favoring the prompt enactment of legislation to provide periodic payments and medical care in the event of injury or death sustained in the performance of duty to civilian defense workers, such payments and benefits to apply with respect to any death or injury sustained by any civilian defense worker subsequent to December 6, 1941; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A petition of sundry citizens, students of the School of Pharmacy of the University of Maryland, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 2690, to establish a pharmacy corps in the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition, numerous signed, of sundry citizens of White City, Kans., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of alcoholic liquor and to suppress vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. TAFT:

Petitions of numerous citizens and organizations, all in the State of Ohio, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, to prohibit the sale of alcoholic liquor and to suppress vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

Petitions, numerous signed, by sundry citizens of Alameda (25 signatures), Alhambra (23 signatures), Arlington (70 signatures), Aromas (61 signatures), Berkeley (20 signatures), Corona (150 signatures), Fairfield and Cordelia (20 signatures), Fresno (15 signatures), Glendale (4 signatures), Los Angeles (1,200 signatures), Los Gatos (22 signatures), Modesto (30 signatures), Oakland (102 signatures), Pasadena (15 signatures), Riverside (12 signatures), San Mateo County (30 signatures), members of First Methodist Church of Sacramento (50 signatures), members of Church of the Latter Day Saints, San Diego (75 signatures), members of Free Methodist Church of California, Los Angeles and Riverside (30 signatures), members of the Women's Mission Society, Eleventh Baptist Church, Los Angeles (75 signatures), members of Women of the Women's Christian Temperance Union, Breese Avenue Church of the Nazarene of Pasadena (20 signatures), and a group of mothers of Riverside (25 signatures), all in the State of California, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, to prohibit the sale of alcoholic liquor and to suppress vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

**LETTER FROM YALEVILLE (CONN.) W. C. T. U.—TAXATION OF NARCOTIC DRUGS**

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask that there be placed at this point in the RECORD and appropriately referred a self-explanatory communication which I have received from Mrs. M. B. McKinnon, president of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union at Yalesville, Conn., relating to a House bill concerning the taxation of narcotic drugs.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YALEVILLE, December 7, 1942.

DEAR SENATOR MALONEY: We most respectfully ask that you give this most important bill (H. R. 7568) your consideration and influence before coming home. Please insert this appeal in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. We have failed to see any former appeals so inserted from Connecticut.

Sincerely,

Mrs. M. B. MCKINNON,  
President of Yalesville W. C. T. U.

**PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR SALES AND SUPPRESSION OF VICE AROUND MILITARY CAMPS—LETTER AND STATEMENT FROM SAN JUAN (P. R.) WOMAN'S CHRISTIAN TEMPERANCE UNION—PETITIONS**

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD and appropriately referred a letter from the president of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of San Juan, P. R., together with a statement from that organization.

There being no objection, the letter and statement were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WOMAN'S CHRISTIAN  
TEMPERANCE UNION,  
San Juan, P. R., March 31, 1942.

HON. W. LEE O'DANIEL,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR O'DANIEL: I have read with great interest your speech in behalf of bill S. 860 made before Congress on January 16.

LXXXVIII—601

The Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Puerto Rico has been getting signatures to back this bill for some time and we have sent quite a number to the Hon. ANDREW J. MAY, chairman, House Military Affairs Committee.

I have written a short letter for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in the name of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and encouraged by the reading of your splendid speech, I am making bold to send the letter to you with the hope that you might have it appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as soon as possible.

The drink problem is most distressing here in Puerto Rico and it is heart-breaking to see so many of our fine boys from the mainland come down here and go to the dogs. Beer is sold so cheap in the camps that they fill up on that and make a dive for stronger liquor as soon as they are on leave. There have been many accidents and a large number of suicides among the Puerto Rican and American servicemen due to alcoholic beverages. Drastic measures should be taken immediately if we really wish to avoid another Pearl Harbor incident.

I shall greatly appreciate your interest in this matter and hope you will forgive me for having taken this liberty.

Yours very sincerely,

EDITH M. IRVINE-RIVERA,  
President.

Last August, some 800 signatures to a petition asking that bill S. 860 be given earnest consideration and be adopted for the protection of our boys in the Army and Navy were mailed to the Honorable ANDREW J. MAY. Since then 946 more have been secured and mailed to Representative MAY.

These signatures were secured through the local Woman's Christian Temperance Unions operating throughout the island and only represent a small proportion who are extremely anxious that this bill be adopted.

There has never been so much drinking in Puerto Rico as there is today. Due to the fact that the servicemen get beer so cheap on the military posts and, worse still, that there are liquor places and houses of ill repute near the posts and everywhere throughout the island, social conditions are most distressing. Crime, suicide, and accidents have reached an incredible peak, and we feel that it is high time for our defenders to be defended from these vice traps.

Heading a list of 108 petitioners living in the mountains of Puerto Rico are these words: "We all protest against liquor and wish to cooperate with the national defense." This voices the sentiments of thousands of Puerto Ricans who are loyal American citizens and whose sons are enlisted and stand ready to fight the enemy to the bitter end. They know, however, that no matter how loyal or brave or well trained their sons may be, they cannot render as efficient service while under the influence of intoxicating liquor.

The entire constituency of evangelical churches and the entire membership of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union represented by 38 local unions unite in this request that our legislators give this important bill immediate attention, and stop this wreckage of human lives through the use of alcoholic beverages by adopting it. This golden opportunity awaits you, the lawmakers of our Nation. We, the mothers of this Nation, who are giving our sons in sacrificial devotion to the great cause of democracy, are counting on you to protect them from the use of liquor inside and outside of the military camps, and by the adoption of this bill, S. 860, bring about the suppression of vice in all military zones.

Mothers of Puerto Rico ask you to make this bill a law before Mother's Day, and you

may be sure that as we ask you to heed our petition we are asking God to guide you in this all-important matter.

Most respectfully yours,

WOMAN'S CHRISTIAN TEMPERANCE  
UNION OF PUERTO RICO.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a record of petitions which I have received in support of Senate bill 860. They represent the views of 2,587 people from 14 States and the District of Columbia.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Petitions received by Senator O'Daniel in support of Senate bill 860

Pennsylvania:	
Philadelphia	603
Quarryville	1
Rhode Island: Providence	101
Tennessee: Dandridge	1
Texas:	
Aledo	57
Aquilla	1
Austin	65
Falfurrias	1
Ganaview	1
Houston	3
Klondike	1
Lexington	12
Mabank	2
Marlin	1
Palestine	1
San Antonio	1
Wharton	1
Wichita Falls	1
Washington:	
Custer	24
Vashon	29
Alabama: Bessemer	5
California: Los Angeles	63
District of Columbia	126
Indiana: South Bend	44
Louisiana: Shreveport	1
Massachusetts: Gloucester	840
New York:	
Brooklyn	45
Houghton	27
Oklahoma: Mangum	1
Wisconsin: Superior	22
Minnesota:	
Ferile	23
Gary	1
Bandette	39
Spooner	29
Williams	1
Pitt	2
Clementson	1
Halstad	2
Warroad	1
Duluth	34
Hopkins	6
Hovland	35
Grand Marais	15
Lakefield	1
St. Louis Park	2
St. Paul	47
Minneapolis	267

14 States and the District of  
Columbia ..... 2,587

**PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR SALES AND SUPPRESSION OF VICE AROUND MILITARY CAMPS—PETITIONS**

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I take great satisfaction and pride in presenting to the United States Senate for its permanent record a series of petitions calling for favorable action on Senate bill 860. These petitions are signed by 24,719 Colorado citizens, representing every county in the State.



It is a matter of deepest regret to these petitioners that the Senate did not see fit to enact this legislation before adjourning this session. They keenly feel that this great Nation should throw every safeguard within its power around its defenders in uniform. Now that 18-year-old boys are being drafted into the armed forces it would seem that the Senate of the United States should give the problem of control of vice and liquor every consideration.

I had hoped that this bill placed on the calendar by the Senate Military Affairs Committee might have come to a recorded vote without being involved in anti-poll-tax and other highly controversial and unrelated legislative proposals.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petitions will lie on the table.

#### REGULATION OF IMPORTATION OF MEAT FROM FOREIGN COUNTRIES—RESOLUTION OF KANSAS STATE GRANGE

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I desire to call the attention of the Senate to the following telegram from C. C. Cogswell, master of the Kansas State Grange, just received by me:

Kansas Grange delegate body unanimously passed the following resolution:

"We protest giving President or any bureau unlimited right by Executive order to remove restrictions on imports and immigration. We are unalterably opposed to lifting any sanitary regulations to permit importation of meat products from foreign countries."

Mr. President, the matter of granting to the President blanket powers to suspend immigration and tariff restrictions undoubtedly will come before the next Congress. The President has indicated he believes he ought to have such powers. I, for one, do not believe that he should, but feel that if he points out specific suspensions or amendments needed to prosecute the war, Congress will grant them. But the time has come—in fact it has passed—for Congress to refuse to grant to the President over-all blanket powers to exercise legislative functions. I will have more to say on this subject later.

#### RATIONING OF GASOLINE FOR FARM USE—RESOLUTIONS OF KANSAS STATE GRANGE

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point as a part of my remarks resolutions of the Kansas State Grange dealing with rationing of gasoline for farm use, and other subjects, which I send to the desk.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Rationing of gasoline and tires must be so administered that farm producers will be enabled to transport their products to market unhampered. To accomplish this end, we favor increased local supervision and allocation of required gasoline and tires for farm trucks and passenger cars used to transport farm commodities.

#### SYNTHETIC RUBBER

Additional materials are needed for manufacturers of truck and auto tires to maintain adequate transportation. To this end we urge immediate production and in every pos-

sible manner the manufacture of synthetic rubber.

We urge the elimination of unnecessary uses of gasoline and wear and tear of tires by the practice of transporting loads both ways, but oppose compulsory rules to that effect.

We advocate more liberal distribution of new trucks and truck parts to farmers.

We further urge the removal of transportation barriers between States.

To relieve the overburdened highway transportation facilities, we recommend that long hauls be shifted to railroads and waterways where possible.

#### COMMITTEE REPORT FILED DURING RECESS

Under authority of the order of the 11th instant,

Mr. WHEELER, from the Committee on Interstate Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 7370) to authorize, during time of war, waiver of compliance with or modification or suspension of the operation of certain provisions of the Communications Act of 1934, reported it on December 14, 1942, with amendments and submitted a report (No. 1846) thereon.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. VAN NUYS, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

H. R. 7810. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the northern district of Alabama; without amendment (Rept. No. 1855).

By Mr. McFARLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

H. R. 7142. A bill relating to the payment of fees, expenses, and costs of witnesses and jurors and the accounting therefor, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1852).

By Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 2856. A bill to provide for the punishment of certain hostile acts against the United States, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1853).

By Mr. GILLETTE, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. Res. 312. Resolution authorizing an investigation of the administration of the laws relating to agricultural commodity prices and subsidies (submitted by Mr. GILLETTE and Mr. REED on October 29, 1942); with an amendment (Rept. No. 1854).

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments:

H. R. 6447. A bill to provide for the orderly transaction of the public business in the event of the death or of the resignation or separation from office of the Chief Disbursing Officer; without amendment (Rept. No. 1851).

#### ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on December 12, 1942, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 357. An act to provide for the establishment and operation of a research laboratory in the Pennsylvania anthracite region for investigation of the mining, preparation and utilization of the mining, preparation and utilization of anthracite, for the development of new uses and markets, for improvement of health and safety in mining; and for a comprehensive study of the region to aid in the solution of its economic problems and to make its natural and human resources of maximum usefulness in the war effort;

S. 1008. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to provide that all cabs for hire in the

District of Columbia be compelled to carry insurance for the protection of passengers, and for other purposes," approved June 29, 1938;

S. 2268. An act to further amend section 126 of the act of June 3, 1916, as amended, to authorize travel pay for certain military and naval personnel on discharge or release or relief from active duty;

S. 2422. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to designate the titles of certain offices and departments of instruction at the United States Military Academy;

S. 2619. An act to amend Article of War 114 so as to broaden the power to administer oaths and take acknowledgments;

S. 2734. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to create a board for the condemnation of insanitary buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved May 1, 1906, as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 2798. An act amending the first sentence of Article of War 52, relative to execution of court-martial sentences;

S. 2824. An act to amend the act of January 24, 1920, so as to authorize the award of a Silver Star to certain persons serving with the Army of the United States;

S. 2867. An act to provide for the appointment of an additional circuit judge for the fifth circuit; and

S. 2891. An act to amend paragraph 8, section 127a, of the National Defense Act so as to authorize certain service to be counted in determining precedence among officers when dates of rank are the same.

#### BILL INTRODUCED

Mr. DOWNEY introduced a bill (S. 2924) for the relief of the State of California, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### AUTHORIZATION FOR RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION TO ISSUE ADDITIONAL NOTES, BONDS, AND DEBENTURES—AMENDMENT

Mr. REED submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 7801) to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to issue notes, bonds, and debentures in the sum of \$5,000,000,000 in excess of existing authority, which was ordered to lie on the table, to be printed, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At the end of the bill insert the following new section:

"SEC. 2. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress that all debts of whatever nature due to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation from common carriers by railroad subject to the Interstate Commerce Act shall be paid to and received by said Corporation as promptly and to the extent that the condition of the several carriers indebted to said Corporation will permit. The Interstate Commerce Commission is hereby vested with jurisdiction and power to determine the extent to which such indebtedness may be safely liquidated in accordance with this policy, and upon application by any interested party or upon its own motion the Interstate Commerce Commission shall exercise the power hereby conferred."

#### PROPOSED ENLARGEMENT OF ROCKY MOUNTAIN NATIONAL PARK—CONTINUANCE OF SENATE RESOLUTION 147, SEVENTY-SIXTH CONGRESS

Mr. BARKLEY (for Mr. HATCH) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 335), which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

Resolved, That Senate Resolution 312, agreed to on September 30, 1940, continuing

Senate Resolution 147, agreed to on January 8, 1940, authorizing the Senate Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, or any subcommittee thereof, to make a thorough investigation of all questions relating to the proposed enlargement of Rocky Mountain National Park, in the State of Colorado, is hereby continued in full force and effect for the same purposes during the Seventy-eighth Congress.

#### SENATOR NORRIS, OF NEBRASKA

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record editorials and articles in tribute to Senator Norris, of Nebraska, which appear in the Appendix.]

#### TO SMASH THE FINAL BOTTLENECK—ARTICLE BY SENATOR PEPPER

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an article entitled "To Smash the Final Bottleneck," written by him and published in the New Republic of the issue of November 30, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### CABLEGRAM FROM GENERAL MACARTHUR TO HOWARD CHANDLER CHRISTY

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record a cablegram sent by General MacArthur to Howard Chandler Christy, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### A TOAST TO GENERAL MACARTHUR AND OUR FIGHTING MEN

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record a statement made by him relative to a toast to General MacArthur and our fighting men proposed by a shipyard worker in the Manitowoc Shipbuilding Yards at Manitowoc, Wis., which appears in the Appendix.]

#### PRODUCTION REQUIREMENTS—RESOLUTIONS BY WISCONSIN FARMERS' CONFERENCE

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record a series of resolutions adopted at the 1942 fourteenth annual farmers' get together conference, held at Madison, Wis., on November 17, 1942, which appear in the Appendix.]

#### TRADE WITH SOVIET RUSSIA—ADDRESS BY THOMAS A. MORGAN

[Mr. BAILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an address entitled "Trade With Soviet Russia," delivered by Thomas A. Morgan, president of the Sperry Gyroscope Co., at Columbia, S. C., February 16, 1932, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### THANKSGIVING DAY—ARTICLE FROM THE PHILADELPHIA INQUIRER

[Mr. DAVIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an article entitled "Why We Celebrate a Thanksgiving Day," written by H. S. J. Sickel, and published in the Philadelphia Inquirer of November 22, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### THE EDUCATION BILL—EDITORIAL FROM THE HARTFORD TIMES

[Mr. MALONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an editorial entitled "The Education Bill," published in the Hartford Times of December 5, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### MR. ICKES' NEW POWERS—EDITORIAL FROM HARTFORD TIMES

[Mr. MALONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an editorial entitled "Mr. Ickes' New Powers," published in the Hartford Times of December 7, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### MR. ICKES' ENLARGED POWERS—EDITORIAL FROM HARTFORD COURANT

[Mr. MALONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an editorial entitled "Mr. Ickes' Enlarged Powers," published in the Hartford Courant of December 5, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### THE WAR EFFORT—POEM BY JAMES PATRICK MCGOVERN

[Mr. ANDREWS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record a poem entitled "The War Effort," by James Patrick McGovern, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### BOMBS OVER ITALY—EDITORIAL FROM IL PROGRESSO ITALO-AMERICANO

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an editorial entitled "Bombs Over Italy," published in the Il Progresso Italo-Americano, of Wednesday, December 9, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### FARM LABOR—ARTICLE BY A. RITCHIE LOW; EDITORIAL FROM NEW ENGLAND HOMESTEAD

[Mr. AIKEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an article entitled "Help Urgently Needed," written by A. Ritchie Low and published in the New England Homestead of November 28, 1942; also an editorial from the same issue, which appear in the Appendix.]

#### REPORT OF THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE ON TRAFFIC LAW ENFORCEMENT

[Mr. MURDOCK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record a summary of the report of the National Committee on Traffic Law Enforcement, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### VICTORY AND PEACE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR NORRIS

[Mr. AIKEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an address on the subject Victory and Peace, delivered by Senator Norris at Carnegie Hall, on December 6, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### IT MAY INTEREST YOU—COLUMN BY WALTER L. HART

[Mr. KILGORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an article entitled "It May Interest You," written by William L. Hart and published in The Dominion News, Morgantown, W. Va., which appears in the Appendix.]

#### REGULATION OF BARBERS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote whereby House bill 5444 was passed by the Senate on Friday last.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion will be entered.

Mr. McCARRAN. I also move that the House be requested to return the bill to the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I ask for order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. McNARY. I now wish to know what is the request made by the Senator from Nevada. The Senate is proceeding so quickly and there is so much noise in the Senate Chamber that it is difficult to hear what is being done. What is the request or the motion?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nevada has entered a motion that the Senate reconsider the vote on House bill 5444. The Senator has also moved that the House return the bill.

Mr. McNARY. What is the bill? I should like some information about it.

Mr. McCARRAN. The bill is by number House bill 5444. The bill pertains to regulation of barbers in the District of Columbia.

Mr. McNARY. May we have stated the title of the bill?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The title of the bill will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 5444) to amend the act to regulate barbers in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, what is the motion?

Mr. McCARRAN. The first motion is to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed. The second motion is to request the House to return the bill.

Mr. McNARY. For what reason?

Mr. McCARRAN. In order that we may reconsider the bill.

Mr. McNARY. That is a general statement. Is the Senator from Nevada opposing the bill?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I will be more explicit. The bill was amended on the floor of the Senate on recommendation of the Committee on the District of Columbia. One word was stricken. The bill went to the House. I now seek to have the bill returned in order that we may recede from our amendment. That is the object of the motion.

Mr. McNARY. I thank the Senator. I think that is quite proper. I have no objection to the motion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the motion requesting the House to return the bill is agreed to.

#### ASSISTANT CLERK, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report back favorably Senate Resolution 320, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That Resolution No. 14, agreed to January 27, 1941, authorizing the Committee on Education and Labor to employ an assistant clerk during the Seventy-seventh Congress, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at the rate of \$2,880 per annum, hereby is continued in full force and effect until the end of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, which I do not intend to do, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.



The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Guffey	Radcliffe
Andrews	Gurney	Reed
Austin	Herring	Schwartz
Bailey	Hill	Scruggs
Barkley	Johnson, Calif.	Shipstead
Bone	Johnson, Colo.	Shott
Brewster	Kilgore	Spencer
Brooks	Langer	Stewart
Brown	Lodge	Taft
Eulow	Lucas	Thomas, Idaho
Burton	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Butler	McFarland	Truman
Byrd	McNary	Tunnell
Capper	Maloney	Tydings
Caraway	Maybank	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	Mead	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	Millikin	Wagner
Danaher	Murdock	Wallgren
Davis	Murray	Walsh
Downey	Nelson	Wheeler
Doxey	Norris	White
Gerry	Nye	Wiley
Gillette	O'Daniel	
Green	Pepper	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 320) submitted by Mr. THOMAS of Utah on November 27, 1942, was considered and agreed to.

#### SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE GASOLINE AND FUEL-OIL SHORTAGES—LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report back favorably Senate Resolution 264, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That the limit of expenditures under Senate Resolution 156, Seventy-seventh Congress, agreed to August 28, 1941 (providing for an investigation with respect to shortages of gasoline, fuel oil, and other petroleum products), is hereby increased by \$10,000.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I was on my feet. Reserving the right to object, I should like to know more about the purpose of the resolution, and also what is the intention of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], as chairman of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, with respect to Senate Resolution 319?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, Senate Resolution 264 was submitted by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY]. It merely increases the amount which has heretofore been allowed under Senate Resolution 156. Senate Resolution 156 was originally submitted, as I recall, in August 1941. Under that resolution the Senator from Connecticut, and the committee which was appointed to make an investigation with respect to the shortages of gasoline, fuel oil, and other petroleum products, held extensive hearings with respect to that very unusual and important problem. The Senator from Connecticut now seeks more money with which to further the investigation he started in 1941. I should like to yield to the Senator from Connecticut in order

that he may, in answer to the question of the Senator from Kansas, make a more elaborate statement as to the full purport of the resolution, what he sought to do in the beginning, and what he expects to do, and can do under the provisions of the resolution now pending.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Illinois asks a question difficult to answer. I do not know what can be done. The principal purpose of the resolution is to ascertain, if possible, what might be done to afford relief to the distressed sections of the country, particularly the more seriously distressed localities, in connection with the shortage of transportation facilities. Much of the problem surrounding this shortage is of necessity a military secret. As the able Senator from Illinois pointed out, the committee was organized a year ago last fall, at the time of an announced shortage of petroleum products. The committee—and I think the Senate will agree—with considerable success, spent some time in investigation, compiled much information, and I think was exceedingly helpful in speeding the transportation of petroleum products to the then seriously affected eastern area. New problems have arisen with the cold weather, and because of the need for carrying petroleum products to our armed forces on and beyond the seas.

I thought—and my thought was shared by members of the so-called Petroleum Shortage Committee—that we ought at this time to have an additional appropriation in order to keep closely in touch with the work to which we were originally assigned by the Senate, to make such investigation as was properly possible, all things considered, and to cooperate with the Petroleum Administrator in connection with the important work in which he is engaged.

While I should like to be able to answer the inquiry as to what we will do, and what we can do, it is simply a question which is as of the moment impossible to answer. We want to put ourselves in the position of being prepared to meet problems, as they may arise, which are a part of the responsibility of the Senate, and in this instance, the responsibility of the special committee. I understand there is no opposition to the resolution, and I hope I have answered, as well as it could be answered, the inquiry made by the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. MALONEY. I do not have the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I wish to ask the able senator from Connecticut if the resolution is confined in its scope to the problems in the Eastern States, or whether it is a Nation-wide responsibility which the Senator's committee accepts.

Mr. MALONEY. It is a Nation-wide responsibility under the original resolution.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I can assure the Senator that his problem is by no means confined to the eastern seaboard. This morning the city health commissioner of Detroit has bluntly announced that a pneumonia epidemic is threatening in

Detroit because of the failure to deliver fuel-oil supplies, and he thinks that the failure is probably due exclusively to the fact that rationing books have not been available for distribution, and that the administrative system of distribution itself is so totally inadequate. With a pneumonia threat following this sort of maladministration, I think there is an immediate job for the able Senator's committee, and I hope it is a Nation-wide job, and not one confined exclusively to the eastern area.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me again?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MALONEY. I should like to point out, in answer to the observation made by the distinguished Senator from Michigan, that it is my understanding that the committee of which the able Senator from Illinois is chairman has reduced the amount of money which was requested by our committee. It will not be possible—and we had best be frank about it—under the amount of money proposed, to go into the situations confronting various sections of the country. If we receive sufficient money it is the hope of the committee that it can meet these serious problems, such as the one to which the Senator from Michigan has just referred; but I am not optimistic about being able to go as deeply into the subject, all over the country, as the need may present, unless the amount of the appropriation is increased.

Mr. REED and Mr. PEPPER addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield, and if so to whom?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I inquire of the Senator from Illinois when we may expect Senate Resolution 319 to be presented for consideration by the Senate? The Senator will remember that 2 weeks ago I talked with him about this matter. The resolution was favorably reported by the Committee on Interstate Commerce. The Senator from Illinois gave me assurance the resolution would be favorably reported by his committee after a conference with the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] could be had. The conference has been had. The resolution deals with a peculiarly regional problem, but it is important. My inquiry of the Senator from Illinois is when Senate Resolution 319 may be expected to be presented for consideration to the Senate.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. I should like to propound an inquiry. I heard the statement made by the able Senator from Connecticut with respect to his proposal for a hearing. Could the purposes of the resolution mentioned by the able Senator from Kansas be included in the one submitted by the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, there is no question that the resolution offered by

the able Senator from Connecticut is Nation-wide in its scope. The committee would have complete jurisdiction over the investigation of the gasoline and fuel-oil situation throughout the country. The resolution would give the committee power to conduct such an investigation.

The resolution requests only \$10,000. The Senator from Illinois is of the opinion that the situation is serious. In the event that amount is not sufficient we shall be glad to consider requests for additional sums in the future in order that the job may be done in a way which will satisfy the Senate and the American people.

Mr. McNARY. I ask the able Senator from Illinois if, as chairman of the committee, his judgment is that the resolution of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] would include all the matters desired to be investigated by the able Senator from Kansas.

Mr. LUCAS. There can be no question about it so far as the language of the resolution is concerned. How far the investigation will go will depend on the attitude of the committee. The Senator from Connecticut has stated to the Senator from Michigan that the problem is Nation-wide and that the committee will investigate every legitimate complaint as expeditiously as possible.

If the Senator from Kansas desires an answer to the question which he submitted to me a moment ago, I will say that the moment we dispose of the resolution which is now pending I shall submit to the Senate for its consideration Resolution 319, to which the Senator from Kansas has referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of Senate Resolution 264?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 264) submitted by Mr. MALONEY on June 11, 1942, was considered and agreed to.

#### PRODUCTION, TRANSPORTATION, AND USE OF FUELS IN CERTAIN AREAS WEST OF THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, without additional amendment, Senate Resolution 319, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. BARKLEY. May I inquire which resolution is referred to?

Mr. LUCAS. The resolution referred to is Senate Resolution 319, submitted by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 319), submitted by Mr. CLARK of Missouri (for himself, Mr. REED, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. TRUMAN, and Mr. CAPPER) on November 25, 1942, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate Commerce with an amendment.

The amendment of the Committee on Interstate Commerce was, on page 3, line 2, after the word "exceed" and the dollar sign, to insert "10,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Whereas the region lying between the Mississippi River and the Rocky Mountains and between the United States-Mexican and the United States-Canadian borders provides the major portion of the national production of crude petroleum and natural gas and a supply of coal ample for its regional needs; and

Whereas, due to confusion of authority and of exercise of war powers delegated by the Congress relating to production, transportation, and use of essential fuels and other materials, this region is threatened with a shortage in the supply of these essential fuels which are produced within its borders: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That a special committee of five Senators, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the production, transportation, and use of fuels, including coal, natural gas, petroleum, fuel oil, and gasoline, in the region lying between the Mississippi River and the Rocky Mountains and between the United States and Mexican border and the United States and Canadian border. The committee shall report to the Senate, as soon as practicable, the results of its study and investigation together with its recommendations, if any, for legislation.

For the purposes of this resolution the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate in the Seventy-seventh and Seventy-eighth Congresses, to employ such experts and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The committee is authorized to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and agencies of the Government. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed \$10,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

#### ASSISTANT CLERK, COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. LUCAS. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate resolution 321, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 321) submitted by Mr. CONNALLY on November 30, 1942, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That Resolution No. 172, agreed to October 9, 1941, authorizing the Committee on Foreign Relations to employ an assistant clerk during the Seventy-seventh Congress to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at the rate of \$3,000 per an-

num, hereby is continued in full force and effect until the end of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

#### ASSISTANT CLERK, COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION

Mr. LUCAS. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 323, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 323) submitted by Mr. RUSSELL on December 3, 1942, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That Resolution No. 15, agreed to January 27, 1941, authorizing the Committee on Immigration to employ an assistant clerk during the Seventy-seventh Congress to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at the rate of \$2,400 per annum, hereby is continued in full force and effect until the end of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

#### ASSISTANT CLERK, COMMITTEE ON INTEROCEANIC CANALS

Mr. LUCAS. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 324, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 324), submitted by Mr. CLARK of Missouri on December 3, 1942, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That Resolution No. 35, agreed to January 27, 1941, authorizing the Committee on Interoceanic Canals to employ an assistant clerk during the Seventy-seventh Congress to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at the rate of \$2,000 per annum, hereby is continued in full force and effect until the end of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

#### ASSISTANT CLERK, COMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS

Mr. LUCAS. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 325, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 325) submitted by Mr. GREEN on December 3, 1942, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That Resolution No. 28, agreed to January 10, 1941, authorizing the Committee on Privileges and Elections to employ an assistant clerk during the Seventy-seventh Congress to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at the rate of \$2,220 per annum, hereby is continued in full force and effect until the end of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

#### ASSISTANT CLERK, COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Mr. LUCAS. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 326, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.



The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 326) submitted by Mr. MALONEY on December 3, 1942, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That Resolution No. 170, agreed to September 29, 1941, authorizing the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds to employ an assistant clerk during the Seventy-seventh Congress, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at the rate of \$1,800 per annum, hereby is continued in full force and effect until the end of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

#### ASSISTANT CLERK, COMMITTEE ON MANUFACTURES

Mr. LUCAS. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 327, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 327) submitted by Mr. OVERTON on December 3, 1942, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That Resolution No. 44, agreed to January 27, 1941, authorizing the Committee on Manufactures to employ an assistant clerk during the Seventy-seventh Congress to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at the rate of \$2,000 per annum, hereby is continued in full force and effect until the end of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

#### ASSISTANT CLERK, COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

Mr. LUCAS. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 328, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 328) submitted by Mr. PEPPER (for Mr. BONE) on December 3, 1942, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That Resolution No. 12, agreed to January 27, 1941, authorizing the Committee on Patents to employ an assistant clerk during the Seventy-seventh Congress to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at the rate of \$2,400 per annum, hereby is continued in full force and effect until the end of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

#### ASSISTANT CLERK—COMMITTEE ON MINES AND MINING

Mr. LUCAS. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 330, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 330) submitted by Mr. GUFFEY on December 4, 1942, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That Resolution No. 60, agreed to March 17, 1941, authorizing the Committee

on Mines and Mining to employ an assistant clerk during the Seventy-seventh Congress to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at the rate of \$1,800 per annum hereby is continued in full force and effect until the end of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

#### TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY CONFERRED BY SENATE RESOLUTIONS FOR INQUIRIES AND INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. LUCAS. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 284, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 284) submitted by Mr. HAYDEN on August 13, 1942, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That all authority conferred by resolutions of the Senate heretofore agreed to authorizing inquiries and investigations by standing, select, or special committees of the Senate, or authorizing expenditures for such purposes, is hereby terminated as of the end of the month of January 1943, unless by further resolution such authority is continued beyond such time.

#### NORTH AFRICAN MILITARY CAMPAIGN—EISENHOWER - DARLAN COLLABORATION

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, the American commander in North Africa, Lt. Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, is proceeding with his critical task under an arrangement which has produced and which continues to produce the effective and desperately important collaboration of the French Admiral Jean Darlan and the great French forces which accept his leadership. The President of the United States has said that this collaboration has "saved British and American lives on the one hand and French lives on the other hand" and that it also has "saved a month or two of valuable time." It obviously has been and is of supreme military importance to the United Nations. It has reached north to Toulon and robbed the Axis of most of the French Fleet which, in enemy hands, would have threatened our entire Mediterranean operations. It has reached as far south as Dakar and delivered to our cause—without the firing of a gun—the whole of the most threatening African outpost which we confronted. The entire Allied strategy on this total second front is interwoven with Eisenhower's cooperative contacts with Darlan who has magnificently kept every engagement he has made with us.

Under such life-and-death circumstances I respectfully suggest that some of our unofficial strategists at home, who by their current criticisms of the Darlan arrangement might succeed in upsetting it, would do better for their country and its fighting sons if they would allow General Eisenhower to win his war as cheaply and as swiftly as possible—saving as many American and British and French lives as possible—saving as much precious time and material as possible—instead of ham-stringing him with their anti-Darlan resentments and their post-war ideologies.

Oh, yes; the post-war pattern of things to come is of supreme concern. We want a righteous "peace for keeps." It would be greatly helpful if our complex war objectives could at once be given simple and conclusive definitions—and I certainly have no quarrel with this pursuit. I can understand, for instance, the De Gaullist factional anxieties over African developments—and the De Gaullists have long and honorable credentials. I can understand the reluctance of long-distance, long-range analysts to rely upon ex-enemies and to embrace them. But, Mr. President, I can also understand that our first objective is to win the war. Otherwise our post-war discussions debate a futility in a vacuum. The north African campaign is in the hands of General Eisenhower. I respectfully suggest that we leave it there. We should support him or replace him. We should not try to do both simultaneously. The general may be guilty of "false finagling with expediency," to quote one of his critics. But he is also guilty of saving American lives, saving months of valuable time, and of amazing bloodless victories in the winning of the war. If that be a crime, I should like to sign his bond. He is out where the shooting is. He is supported by our Chief of Staff and our Commander in Chief. He should not be shot at from the rear—and especially from the sanctuary of this safe home front. I do not plead for Darlan. I plead for Eisenhower. I plead for his armies. I plead for his forward march. We can cross these other bridges when we have bridges to cross. "Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof."

Mr. Mark Sullivan, in a particularly notable and dispassionate analysis of this matter in the Sunday newspapers, concludes as follows:

At a time when we have not won the war, and know the worst of it is still ahead, our decisions should be military.

I ask that the entire Sullivan article be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Star]

There is a condition which, if we understand it and meet it wisely, may save us much loss and grief. The condition is illustrated by an agitation currently active. In North Africa, Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, in charge of American forces, made a military decision, for a military purpose—for the military advantage of the United States. The decision consisted of an arrangement with the acting head of the French Government in North Africa, Admiral Jean Darlan. By the arrangement, Admiral Darlan said that he would order French troops and civilians not to resist the American occupation; that he would order them to cooperate with the Americans against the German and Italian forces whom General Eisenhower had to face.

General Eisenhower accepted the tender, of course. He accepted for a military reason. It would be, and was, to the immense advantage of our Army. It would, and did, avert the loss of thousands of our soldiers. It would, and did, greatly shorten the time required for our occupation of French North Africa. It would, and did, enable General Eisenhower to begin his attack on the Germans and Italians before they had time to get

great reinforcements. As a military decision, General Eisenhower's action was "one of the most profitable in history."

#### PROTEST AGAINST DARLAN

So far we have been discussing a military decision, made by General Eisenhower as a military leader for a military advantage. We now pass to another phase of the incident, which arose later.

News of General Eisenhower's action reached America in the week ended November 14. At once there was an outcry of protest. The outcry came from many shades of thought, but much of it from radicals and liberals. The outcry paid no attention to the military aspect of what General Eisenhower had done. The outcry was all on grounds of policy, of ideology. The outcry said, accurately, that Darlan was a member of the Vichy French Government, which under duress submitted to, and cooperated with, the Nazi conquerors. The outcry charged, whether accurately or not, that Darlan was personally of a Fascist bent of mind. The outcry said that the United States ought to have nothing to do with Darlan; that the only French leader we should ever recognize or have dealings with was the head of the Fighting French, Gen. Charles de Gaulle. (This part of the outcry neglected the fact that De Gaulle was not in North Africa, and could not help us there, while Admiral Darlan was and did.)

What I have written about the outcry against General Eisenhower's understanding with Darlan is incomplete and expresses no judgment about the merit of it. The outcry arose from a wide variety of reasons and came from a wide variety of sources, many of them utterly earnest. Some of it came from the Fighting French and some from the British. The point I emphasize is that the outcry was based wholly on policy, on ideology.

#### ROOSEVELT'S POSITION

When the outcry was getting under way, the first impulse of President Roosevelt and the War Department was to deplore it. Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of War, took personal pains to ask one important critic, Wendell L. Willkie, to refrain.

By November 18, however, Mr. Roosevelt concluded he had better take notice of the outcry and allay it. He read to a press conference, for publication, a carefully prepared statement. He did not "throw down" his subordinate, General Eisenhower—he was punctilious not to. Mr. Roosevelt pointed out and emphasized the military value of General Eisenhower's action. He said that the purpose and effect "was to save American and British lives on the one hand and French lives on the other hand," and that it "saved a month or two of valuable time."

Mr. Roosevelt said, however, that it was "no permanent arrangement," that it was a "temporary arrangement . . . a temporary expedient justified solely by the stress of battle." Mr. Roosevelt said that "no one in our Army has any authority to discuss the future government of France and the French Empire."

While this statement of Mr. Roosevelt did not "throw down" his subordinate, General Eisenhower; while it did not at all repudiate the arrangement General Eisenhower had entered into—nevertheless, one is obliged to consider what was, or might have been, the effect on Darlan. Darlan might readily have wondered where President Roosevelt's statement left him, might have hesitated about going further. The military value achieved by General Eisenhower might have been reduced. Actually, Darlan went on with his understanding and took further steps greatly to the military interest of the United States.

#### TWO KINDS OF DECISIONS

President Roosevelt's statement did not allay the outcry. It went on, and still continues. At a press conference December 1

Cordell Hull, Secretary of State, speaking off-hand, seemed to take notice of the outcry and deplore it. Among other things, he said, according to reporters, that the United States is not concerned at all about political aims and purposes, but only with the terrific undertaking of winning the war in the first place.

This whole incident illustrates a condition which exists, which will continue, and as the war goes on will give rise to other problems, decisions, and agitations as vexing and dangerous as those attending General Eisenhower's action.

The condition may be stated thus: There are two kinds of decisions—one is military, the other has to do with policy, ideology. The two are not always wholly separable; in some cases they overlap. A decision made on grounds of policy or ideology may in some cases have military effect, advantageous or adverse.

Yet in our thinking we can and ought to keep in mind the distinction between the two kinds of decisions. A military decision is made for a military purpose only, for the purpose of winning the war as quickly as possible with the least loss of life.

#### GENERALS VERSUS WALLACE

On the other hand, decisions based on policy or ideology have to do mainly with the kinds of government and society the nations of the world are to have after the war, with quarrels within nations about the form of society and government they desire, such as the one between the Fighting French and Vichy French.

Among the American leaders who direct or influence the conduct of the war, those who are military leaders will make decisions for military purposes only. Always their aim will be to destroy the enemy; to rescue American prisoners held by the enemy; to restore American territory, such as the Philippines, held by the enemy; to reduce the enemy to surrender in the least time with the least loss of American life.

Another group of our leaders have a strong concern with post-war policy and ideology. These include particularly Vice President HENRY A. WALLACE, with others influential in the administration.

As between the two groups of leaders and the two kinds of decisions, there can be no question which should prevail at this stage of the war. At a time when we have not won the war, and know the worst of it is still ahead, our decisions should be military.

MR. VANDENBERG. I also ask to have printed in the RECORD an article by Constantine Brown, entitled "Darlan Loyal Aiding United States Despite Sentiment Against Him in United Nations Capitals."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star of December 10, 1942]

DARLAN LOYALLY AIDING UNITED STATES DESPITE SENTIMENT AGAINST HIM IN UNITED NATIONS CAPITALS

(By Constantine Brown)

Admiral Jean Darlan went on record last week as stating that he intends to retire into private life as soon as the war is over, the Axis is defeated, and France is restored to her own people.

The French admiral, according to reports which have reached officials in Washington, feels that he will soon be too old to try and maintain a naval job, and has no ambition or desire to enter the political arena in his own country. Young men will have to take over the difficult reconstruction problems of post-war France.

In the meantime, however, despite the continuous attacks against him in Britain and to a certain extent in the United States, the admiral continues to collaborate most loyally with the American supreme command in Algeria and in Morocco. The skeptical and sometimes cynical French admiral has implicit confidence in the word given to the French people by President Roosevelt that the United Nations are only in temporary control of the French African empire, and will restore it to the French people as soon as the present emergency is over and the enemy is defeated.

Because he knows there is not a single example in history in which we have not kept our solemn pledges, he has used the prestige he enjoys with French Army, Navy, and civil officials to make things as easy as possible for American occupation forces.

#### HARMONY WITH DARLAN

Although we are now established with a substantial army in the area between Casablanca and Algiers, French support continues to be essential to the American high command. According to reports from North Africa, the collaboration between Admiral Darlan and his group of generals, admirals, and colonial officials and the American commander in chief, Lt. Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, is most harmonious.

Admiral Darlan and his followers in some instances have delivered more than they have promised. At one time there was some doubt whether we could ask that the remaining French Fleet be sent actually to fight on our side. The protocol which was signed between General Eisenhower and Admiral Darlan provides for cooperation but it appears there is nothing definite about the French men-of-war actually battling for the Allies.

This matter is said to have been finally settled, and we may expect aid from a number of French men-of-war which proved in the battle for Casablanca that they are excellent fighters, and can help us tremendously in the Mediterranean.

It is true that the agreement between Admiral Darlan and General Eisenhower is only of a temporary nature since it has not received the official stamp from Washington.

#### PUZZLED OVER RETICENCE

Neither the American military men in Africa nor the French can quite understand why the United States Government continues its present reticence toward a man who has saved the lives of thousands of Americans and shortened so drastically the military operations in North Africa.

There is, of course, the feeling that political considerations not based purely on ideology are the actual reasons for continuance of anti-Darlan sentiment in the United Nations capitals.

Admiral Darlan, who is becoming less sensitive to the cold shouldering he is receiving from Washington, thought at one time that British political commitments given Gen. Charles de Gaulle were at the bottom of the whole trouble. He and the commander of the French forces in Africa, Gen. Henri Honore Giraud, made it known through indirect sources that although General de Gaulle's contribution to the Allied cause had been confined to the political and intelligence field, they were willing to accept his military organization as part of the National French Army in Africa.

It was pointed out that General de Gaulle, who is a junior general, would have to take a subordinate place in the military branch in which he excels, the armored forces.

It seems that the proposal has not been well received in London and received no consideration from the leader of the Fighting French.

American military men who judge the situation from a purely military point of view thought that Admiral Darlan's offer was equitable and logical.



There is still hope that the French may soon become united. General de Gaulle is expected in Washington in January, and will be received by President Roosevelt. It is possible that after his visit he may change his mind and decide to let by-gones be by-gones and accept a military position for which he has had the proper training.

#### OVERTIME PAY FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, from the Committee on Civil Service, I report an original joint resolution (S. J. Res. 170) extending until April 30, 1943, the period for which overtime rates of compensation may be paid under the acts of June 28, 1940 (54 Stat. 676), October 21, 1940 (54 Stat. 1205), and June 3, 1941 (55 Stat. 241), and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 1847) thereon.

The joint resolution was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

*Resolved, etc., That the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution extending the period for which overtime rates of compensation may be paid under certain acts," approved July 3, 1942, is amended by striking out "November 30, 1942," and inserting "April 30, 1943":* *Provided, That the authorization contained herein to pay overtime compensation to certain groups of employees is hereby extended, effective December 1, 1942, to all civilian employees in or under the United States Government, including Government-owned or controlled organizations (except employees in the legislative and judicial branches), and to those employees of the District of Columbia municipal government who occupy positions subject to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended:* *Provided further, That such extension shall not apply to (a) those whose wages are fixed on a daily or hourly basis and adjusted from time to time in accordance with prevailing rates by wage boards or similar administrative authority serving the same purpose, (b) elected officials, (c) heads of departments, independent establishments, and agencies, and (d) employees outside the continental limits of the United States, including Alaska, who are paid in accordance with local prevailing native wage rates for the area in which employed:* *Provided further, That overtime compensation authorized herein and under the act approved February 10, 1942 (Public Law No. 450, 77th Cong.), and section 4 of the act approved May 2, 1941 (Public Law No. 46, 77th Cong.), as amended, shall be payable only on that part of an employee's basic compensation not in excess of \$2,900 per annum, and each such employee shall be paid only such overtime compensation or portion thereof as will not cause his aggregate compensation to exceed a rate of \$5,000 per annum:* *And provided further, That officers or employees whose compensation is based on mileage, postal receipts, fees, piecework, or other than a time period basis or whose hours of duty are intermittent, irregular, or less than full time, substitute employees whose compensation is based upon a rate per hour or per day, and employees in or under the legislative and judicial branches, shall be paid additional compensation, in lieu of the overtime compensation authorized herein, amounting to 10 percent of so much of their earned basic compensation as is not in excess of a rate of \$2,900 per annum, and each such employee shall be paid only such additional compensation or portion thereof as will not cause his aggregate compensation to exceed a rate of \$5,000 per annum.*

Sec. 2. Within 30 days after the enactment of this act the heads of departments and agencies in the executive branch, whose employees are affected by the provisions of this joint resolution, shall present to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget such information as he shall require for the purpose of

justifying the number of employees in their respective departments or agencies. If any such department or agency fails to present such information or if, in the opinion of the Director, the information so presented fails to disclose that the number of such employees in any department or agency is necessary to the proper and efficient exercise of its functions, the personnel of such department or agency shall be reduced, upon the order of the Director, by such number as the Director finds to be in excess of the minimum requirements of such department or agency. Upon the expiration of 30 days from the date of issuance of such order by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget the provisions of the first section of this joint resolution shall cease to be applicable to the employees of the agency affected by such order, unless and until the head thereof has certified to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget that such order has been complied with. The Civil Service Commission is authorized to transfer to other departments or agencies any employees released pursuant to this section, whose services are needed in and can be effectively utilized by such other departments or agencies.

Sec. 3. The provisions of the Saturday half-holiday law of March 3, 1931 (46 Stat. 1482; U. S. C., title 5, sec. 26 (a)), are hereby suspended for the period during which this joint resolution is in effect.

Sec. 4. This joint resolution shall take effect as of December 1, 1942, and shall terminate on April 30, 1943, or such earlier date as the Congress by concurrent resolution may prescribe.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I believe I favor the general objectives of the joint resolution. There are many sides to the question, and there has been much discussion. A few days ago a hurried attempt was made to pass remedial legislation. I shall not object, but I desire a full explanation of the purposes of the joint resolution, and a statement as to whether it meets with the entire accord of the committee. I wish general discussion to be had before consenting to its immediate consideration.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, the minority leader has asked, and very properly, that I explain the purport of the joint resolution. Let me say that after the discussion of a few days ago the Committee on Civil Service went diligently to work. The distinguished chairman of the committee, whom I desire to compliment very highly, and who presided over our destinies for the last time, at least for awhile, was deeply concerned with the preparation of a measure which would receive the approval of the Senate. There were in attendance at the committee meetings the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. ARKEN], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], whose seats are on the other side of the aisle, and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNER], myself, and perhaps one or two other Senators whose seats are on this side of the aisle. We have reported a joint resolution which would be a temporary or stop-gap measure, so that in the next session there would be opportunity to go into all phases of the problem.

The resolution would terminate on April 30, 1943. It would apply to only

the lower-paid employees. We have recommended a \$2,900 ceiling in all cases, and no salary in excess of \$5,000 could be increased as a result of the operation of the provisions of the resolution.

By section A the provisions of the joint resolution which has just been outlined would be extended to Army and Navy employees until April 30, 1943.

Section B would extend the same provisions to other employees.

Section C would establish a ceiling so that an employee could receive time and a half pay for overtime only on \$2,900 of his salary, and so that under no circumstances could such overtime payments be made to an employee receiving over \$5,000.

Section D would grant a 10-percent bonus. In the committee we discussed the bonus provisions in the measure we previously reported which provided a 20-percent bonus to the lower-paid employees. We thought that by the provisions of the pending measure, because it is to be only temporary, we could cut that to 10 percent for employees who cannot qualify for the overtime pay provisions.

The joint resolution proposes to repeal for the duration the Saturday half-holiday law, so that the departments may organize their work-week on a longer or on a 6-day basis. Now they are prohibited from doing so because of the inhibition of the Saturday half-holiday law.

The joint resolution grants authority to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to require the reorganization of the departments of Government within the reasonable needs of personnel; and it gives the Civil Service Commission authority to transfer personnel from one agency to another, so that there will be no surplus personnel.

It is also provided that any agency which violates regulations prescribed by the resolution will have the overtime or the 10-percent bonus features denied to them and their employees.

Furthermore, the joint resolution provides that elected officials, the heads of bureaus and agencies, and others receiving higher salaries shall not receive the benefits accruing under the provisions of the measure.

The joint resolution would not extend to employees outside the limits of the continental United States. It would not extend to employees who now have their wages adjusted by wage boards or similar tribunals. It merely provides that employment conditions of Army and Navy workers shall be extended to other employees; and in cases in which the employees cannot be organized on an overtime pay allowance basis it provides a 10-percent bonus, and places a ceiling of \$2,900. The provision is that the first \$2,900 of the pay received by a man drawing \$3,000, for instance, is all that can be figured for either the 10-percent bonus or the time-and-a-half-pay provision.

As I have said, the joint resolution would repeal the Saturday half-holiday law, and would give the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and the heads of the Civil Service Commission plenary powers.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, let me inquire what the cost is estimated to be?

Mr. MEAD. It was estimated that the original measure would have cost \$390,000,000, but the joint resolution as reported cuts that—on the basis of a quick estimate—by at least one-third, considering the cost as applied to the Army and the Navy and the cost of the bonus. We cut the bonus to 10 percent; and by terminating the Saturday half holiday the employees are called upon to work a longer workweek, for which they will be compensated. With the longer workweek I should say that the estimated cost will be approximately \$260,000,000.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MEAD. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Would the resolution cover the entire civilian personnel of the Government?

Mr. MEAD. It would cover the entire personnel of the Government except those employees covered by wage boards and those who are under the Maritime Commission. The provisions as to the terms of their employment run a little longer, but eventually the resolution would cover all civil-service employees.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Then, if I happen to have the idea that a great many of the "mushroom" services are tremendously overstaffed and with a great many employees who should not be on the pay roll at all, am I to be asked to vote to increase the compensation of those whom I think the agencies should not have?

Mr. MEAD. The committee had that situation in mind. We accepted two amendments, one offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] and the other offered by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], giving the agencies of Government in charge of personnel explicit authority to prevent the herding of employees or the accumulation of surplus employees, and providing authority to transfer employees, and to withhold overtime payments and bonus payments if the agencies do not follow instructions. So we went as deeply into the matter as we could. In addition, provision is made that employees receiving over \$5,000 a year and who now are receiving time and a half pay for overtime shall be denied that privilege; and we place a ceiling over all. The ceiling is \$2,900, and only on \$2,900 of an employee's pay can he receive the overtime or bonus payments.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I thank the Senator for his statement, and I hope the injunction he has written into the measure will not prove to be merely wishful thinking—which it seems to me is the probability.

Mr. MEAD. The measure is only temporary, at any rate; we shall go into the matter again in January.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, let me ask what is the number of employees affected.

Mr. MEAD. Upward of 2,500,000.

Mr. McNARY. At a cost of \$250,000,000; is that correct?

Mr. MEAD. Approximately that—perhaps \$260,000,000.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I think it should be made clear that at least a mil-

lion of the employees who are doing mechanical work in the arsenals and navy yards have been receiving time and a half pay for overtime. The provision under which they have received such pay expired December 1.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I understand that hereafter any stenographer, let us say, in the Department of Labor who works over 40 hours a week and works 6 days will receive time and a half pay for all work done in excess of 40 hours; is that correct?

Mr. MEAD. That is correct.

Mr. TAFT. Would such a stenographer also receive the 10-percent bonus?

Mr. MEAD. No; if an employee received one benefit he would not receive the other. In the measure we specify those who are to receive a 10-percent increase. They are those who by reason of the fact that they are paid on a mileage-fee basis or on an intermittent-employment basis cannot well be covered by the provision for time and a half pay for overtime. There are many employees who do not receive either overtime pay or other compensation for extra hours worked; and if it is not found necessary to have them work over 40 hours a week, they will remain just where they are, so far as their pay is concerned.

Mr. TAFT. Let us consider an employee who has been working 40 hours a week, say, a stenographer. The joint resolution provides for the 6-day week; and if the employee worked for 48 hours, he or she would be paid time and a half for the 8 hours of extra work. That would be equivalent to about a one-third increase.

Mr. MEAD. No; a 21-percent increase. They would not be given really time and a half pay. They would be given time and a half pay on the basis of a 360-day year, whereas they work only a 260-day year; so the provision amounts approximately to only time and a quarter; it is not time and a half.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator from New York how the joint resolution would apply to postal employees.

Mr. MEAD. The postal employees will receive time and a half pay on the basis of a 360-day year. In reality, it is time and a quarter. However, the work of postal employees—rural-route mail carriers, railway mail clerks, and so forth—cannot be organized on a 6-day work-week basis; and such employees would receive the 10-percent bonus. The resolution would apply in either one way or the other.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Does the Senator believe that the resolution will meet with the approval of the Postal Service?

Mr. MEAD. I believe that the Postal Service will give its hearty approval to the resolution because it is only temporary and because it gives the employees something they do not now enjoy.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator whether the resolution would apply to the employees of the Senate and the House?

Mr. MEAD. It would apply to all legislative employees except those who might not come under the ceiling—\$2,900 or \$5,000.

Mr. McNARY. Yes.

Mr. MEAD. But to all the others it would apply. It is a measure for the relief of underpaid employees or employees in the lower categories of the legislative, judicial, and civil-service branches of the Federal Government.

Mr. McNARY. I am curious to know whether the measure would apply to all employees of the Senate and the House receiving less than \$2,900?

Mr. MEAD. It would apply to every one of them.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, the Senator from New York replied to the question of the Senator from Michigan indicating that the joint resolution would apply to all employees of the Federal Government. I understand that the Senator expects to offer a separate bill relating to employees of the District of Columbia; is that correct?

Mr. MEAD. That is correct. The Senator from Nevada is offering a measure which covers policemen and firemen.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, I desire to ask him a question. I do not quite understand about the two ceilings—the \$2,900 and the \$5,000.

Mr. MEAD. If an employee receives \$5,000, he cannot receive either the overtime payments or the bonus because such payment would serve to make his wages total more than \$5,000. That is one ceiling. If an employee received \$4,000 annually, he could receive overtime or he could receive a bonus on \$2,900 of his salary, but not enough to make his total pay exceed \$5,000.

Mr. BARKLEY. In other words, those who are paid less than \$2,900 or those who are paid \$2,900 a year—

Mr. MEAD. There would be no other ceilings as to them.

Mr. BARKLEY. They would receive either the bonus or the overtime payments; is that correct?

Mr. MEAD. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. Those whose pay ranges between \$2,900 and \$5,000—

Mr. MEAD. They could receive only such amount of the benefits as would not make their total pay exceed \$5,000.

Mr. BARKLEY. They would come under another category, but under either one or the other their pay would not exceed \$5,000; is that correct?

Mr. MEAD. That is correct.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, in view of the explanation and the debate which followed, I have no objection to the consideration of the joint resolution.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I should like to know on what basis the legislative employees are treated—whether on the basis of the 10-percent increase or time and a half pay for overtime.

Mr. MEAD. A 10-percent increase of their pay.

Mr. President, I ask for the consideration and passage of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution? The Chair hears none.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 170) extending until April 30, 1943, the period for which overtime rates of compensation may be



paid under the acts of June 28, 1940 (54 Stat. 676), October 21, 1940 (54 Stat. 1205), and June 3, 1941 (55 Stat. 241), and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. BYRD subsequently said: Mr. President, for the information of those who read the RECORD I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the report of the Committee on Civil Service on the Senate joint resolution which has just been agreed to.

There being no objection, the report (No. 1847) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Civil Service which has had under consideration the matter of overtime compensation for employees of the Federal Government reports favorably a joint resolution extending until April 30, 1943, the period for which overtime rates of compensation may be paid under the acts of June 28, 1940 (54 Stat. 676), October 21, 1940 (54 Stat. 1205), and June 3, 1941 (55 Stat. 241), and for other purposes, and recommends that the joint resolution do pass.

Since 1940, due to the national defense and war programs, a series of statutes has authorized the payment of additional compensation for overtime work performed by per annum employees in the War and Navy Departments. These statutes, as originally enacted, were effective only until June 30, 1942. However, such authorization was extended from time to time until November 30, 1942, when it was allowed to expire.

The employees covered by these statutes are, for the most part, engaged in vital war work and the committee has been advised that a failure to extend this authority to pay overtime compensation will result in substantial decreases in the incomes of such employees and, in turn, will create personnel problems which will have serious effects upon the war effort.

The committee also feels, however, that the present discriminatory practice of permitting the payment of overtime compensation only to certain groups should not be permitted to continue, and that all employees of the Government should be put on the same basis. It has not been possible, in the short space of time available, to arrive at an entirely satisfactory solution to the problem, and the joint resolution submitted by the committee is in the form of a temporary measure to be effective only until April 30, 1943. In the meantime the committee proposes to continue its study of the problems involved with a view to making additional recommendations for further adjustments early in the new Congress.

The joint resolution provides for the extension until April 30, 1943, of the laws authorizing the payment of overtime compensation to per annum employees in the War and Navy Departments, and for the extension of such authority to cover other employees of the Government. The joint resolution will not affect employees whose compensation is based upon hourly rates fixed and adjusted by wage boards or similar administrative wage-fixing authority, elected officials, heads of departments and agencies, and certain employees outside the continental limits of the United States who are paid at native wage rates prevailing in the areas in which they are employed.

The overtime compensation payable under the joint resolution would be computed at the rate of one and one-half times an em-

ployee's regular basic rate. For the purposes of such computation the basic rate for 1 day will be considered to be one three-hundred-and-sixtieth of so much of an employee's annual salary as does not exceed \$2,900 per annum. The joint resolution provides all overtime compensation authorized therein, including that payable to War and Navy Department employees under the statutes which are extended in the first section of the joint resolution, will be payable only on the first \$2,900 of an employee's salary, and no overtime compensation may be paid to an employee whose salary is \$5,000 or more, nor could any employee receive overtime compensation under the joint resolution in an amount which would cause his aggregate compensation to exceed \$5,000 per annum. The \$2,900 and \$5,000 ceilings are also made applicable to certain Maritime Commission and National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics employees who have been receiving overtime compensation under the acts of May 2, 1941, and February 10, 1942.

Provision is made for the payment of additional compensation to certain employees, the nature of whose work does not readily lend itself to an overtime pay program. Such additional compensation would amount to 10 percent of so much of an employee's salary as does not exceed a rate of \$2,900 per annum, and would be subject to the \$5,000 ceiling referred to in the preceding paragraph. Included in this category would be employees whose compensation is based on mileage, postal receipts, fees, piecework, or other than a time period basis or whose hours of duty are intermittent, irregular, or less than full time, substitute employees who are paid at hourly or daily rates, and employees in the legislative and judicial branches of the Government.

Under section 2, heads of executive departments and agencies must satisfy the Director of the Bureau of the Budget that the number of employees in their respective departments and agencies is necessary to the efficient functioning of such departments and agencies. If, in the opinion of the Director, any such department or agency has more than enough employees to fulfill its needs, he is authorized to order a reduction in its personnel. If any agency fails to comply with such order of the Director within 30 days after its issuance the employees of such department or agency may not be paid further additional compensation under this joint resolution until the Director receives a certification that the reduction order has been complied with. The Civil Service Commission is authorized to transfer employees released under this section to other departments or agencies in which their services are needed and can be effectively utilized.

Section 3 provides for suspension of the Saturday half-holiday law of March 3, 1931, which required the granting of compensatory time off for work in excess of 4 hours on Saturday. This provision will enable heads of departments and agencies to increase the workweek of their employees, thus enabling them to utilize their present personnel resources to the fullest extent.

The joint resolution would take effect as of December 1, 1942, and would continue in effect until April 30, 1943.

As was stated above, the committee is of the opinion that further study should be given to the matter of Government salary practices as soon as possible. It believes, however, that the enactment of this joint resolution as a temporary expedient will be a step in the right direction, that it will do a great deal toward improving the morale of employees in the lower salary brackets, and eliminating the present excessive rate of turnover in the Federal service which is attributable to a great extent to the inability of such employees to meet increased living costs.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred two petitions and a telegram. The petitions are signed by several thousand persons, but I do not ask to have their names included in the RECORD.

Their cause is just and I have used my efforts to aid them. I am glad that the Civil Service Committee has reported a resolution that will temporarily relieve the situation, and I am pleased that no Senator has objected.

There being no objection, the petitions, without the names attached, and telegram were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This is to bring to your attention a deplorable condition which we feel should and could be remedied.

As you know, the failure of the President to sign an extension to the temporary legislation covering the overtime pay of the Federal per annum employees has directly affected thousands of this Nation's workers.

Professional and clerical employees' wages are reduced to or below that of laborers working the same number of hours.

The standard of living remains at wartime levels, whereas the salaries of Federal employees are greatly reduced.

It is understood that a bill has been, or is to be, introduced which will adjust the wages of the above groups of employees. It is requested that your attention be given this matter.

It is imperative that immediate steps be taken to alleviate this situation as it is impossible to maintain an economic balance under the present conditions.

Information regarding what action has been taken on this matter would be appreciated.

NOVEMBER 30, 1942.

Senator B. R. MAYBANK,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Expiration of present overtime pay law reduces our income \$25 to \$40 per month and works severe hardship. Clerical employees in grades 1, 2, and 3, even with overtime pay, receive less than classified laborers cleaning and sweeping floors. Study of wage rates and classification pay rates show mechanics receive \$60 to \$90 a week while clerical employees average \$30 to \$50 a week. Mechanics are paid overtime for Sunday work but clerical force receive no overtime, but are given a weekday off. We have been compelled to depend on overtime pay to feed, clothe, and shelter our families, and meet additional obligations thrust upon us. Under present Executive orders we cannot even accept more remunerative positions elsewhere and must appeal to Congress to alleviate our condition. We therefore urge you to do everything possible to have pending legislation providing relief rushed through to enactment.

CHARLESTON, S. C., December 10, 1942.  
BURNETT R. MAYBANK:

Overtime pay, Government employees expired December 1. Action is desired to relieve the present situation that now exists. Your earnest consideration of the present bill before the Senate is desired by several thousand of your constituents employed at this port before adjournment this session.

F. L. THOMPSON,  
Lodge 729, American Federation  
of Government Employees.

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Calloway, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2655) to amend the Judicial Code to authorize the Chief Justice of the United States to assign circuit judges to temporary duty in circuits other than their own.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7171) for the relief of Mrs. J. C. Tommey.

ADDITIONAL REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE INVESTIGATING THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM—LUMBER AND FOREST PRODUCTS (PT. 14 OF REPT. NO. 480)

Mr. WALLGREN. Mr. President, by direction of the Special Committee Investigating the National Defense Program, I submit an interim report on lumber and forest products.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President—

Mr. WALLGREN. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I ask for the regular order. I think the business of the Senate should proceed in the usual manner. When a Senator gets the floor he should follow through. I insist on the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington has the floor and will proceed.

Mr. WALLGREN. Mr. President, this additional report of the Truman Committee discloses that according to best estimates the Nation faces an acute lumber shortage in 1943. The Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture estimates that 31,100,000 board feet will be required for military and essential civilian use in 1943. This is a minimum estimate and does not provide for unforeseen emergencies. The expected 1943 production will be only 29,000,000,000 board feet. Particularly, shortages will be felt in important types of lumber used in shipbuilding, pontoons, and heavy construction. However, the War Production Board is more optimistic than the Forest Service and believes that 1942 production schedules may be maintained next year.

The report emphasizes that in order to cushion the effect of the impending shortage the armed services must—

Simplify . . . specifications and adapt their standards to types or species of lumber most readily available and suitable to the purposes for which they are intended. This is of the utmost importance, as every effort should be made wherever possible to force the Army and Navy to relax specifications where it can be done without sacrificing a military advantage.

The committee report recommends that the War Production Board consider the establishment of a regional office in the Pacific Northwest region in addition to the regional office now located in San Francisco. This Northwest office should be headed by a competent administrator

familiar with lumber operations, and he should have sufficient power to carry out decisions effectively. The new regional administrator should seek the advice and counsel of all lumber operators as well as employees represented by both the A. F. of L. and the C. I. O.

The Truman report gives considerable attention to the Forest Products Service plan which was designed to stimulate production of necessary lumber products by providing loans and firm markets for small producers. The plan has been approved by the War Production Board and Department of Agriculture, and is awaiting final approval by the President. The committee found that consideration of this plan was unnecessarily delayed in the War Production Board. The plan was first submitted by the Forest Service in June 1942 and joint approval was not given until November 18, 1942. In this connection the committee concludes:

The committee believes that it is a serious mistake for any officials dealing with any part of the war program to fail to be frank and fair with other agencies of the Government having to do with the same situation. The committee believes that where differences between agencies exist each should make a full and complete disclosure to the other of the exact points on which they differ, and their reasons therefor, so that the points of difference can be reduced to a minimum and when so reduced can be presented to higher Government authorities for determination. Mr. Ben Alexander should be censured for having intentionally failed to follow such a policy. The action resulted in the unnecessary prolongation of a dispute between the Lumber Division of the War Production Board, of which he is the Chief, and the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture, to the detriment of the war effort.

The Truman report notes the action of the Canadian authorities in preventing the continuation of the pre-war practice of shipping American-owned logs from Crown grant lands in British Columbia to American mills in the Puget Sound region. This action on the part of the Canadian Government has had a serious effect upon the production of lumber in the Pacific Northwest which is vital to the war effort. The committee recommends that the War Production Board present the facts with respect to this situation to the Forest Products Subcommittee of the Materials Coordinating Committee of the United States and Canada and insists that appropriate action be taken to remedy this situation.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before he takes his seat?

Mr. WALLGREN. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Am I to understand that the committee approved the so-called forest-products service plan, which was initiated by the United States Forest Service?

Mr. WALLGREN. The committee does not exactly approve the plan; it leaves it up to the experts, and cautions them that they should use the utmost care in trying to put that plan into effect.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I suppose the Senator, of course, is familiar with the protest of the 30 national and regional groups of producers and distributors of

lumber who are insisting that, in the guise of war relief, this is a plan for the regimenting and reorganization of the trade, and that the plan is untenable from their point of view? I assume the Senator is familiar with all those objections?

Mr. WALLGREN. I am, because I have had practically the same objections.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Does the Senator dismiss the objections as having no validity?

Mr. WALLGREN. No, so far as I am concerned I do not, but I believe that the committee feel that both the War Production Board and the Department of Agriculture can work out a plan. The committee do not approve of this particular plan as I understand.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I was under the impression that the Truman committee as such had disapproved this particular plan.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, the committee neither approved nor disapproved it, let me say to the able Senator from Michigan, for the simple reason that there is a tremendous prospective shortage of lumber, just as there is of steel and aluminum, and some means must be found to get the lumber. The War Production Board and the Forest Service have reached an agreement on a plan which they say will get the lumber. If it will get the lumber, that is what we want.

Mr. WALLGREN. I think every consideration ought to be given to the fact that most of the small mills which will be helped by this subsidy, if it may be so called, are producing a very small amount of lumber in the war program, and the type of lumber they are producing is not so greatly needed at the present time. It is true enough that many of the smaller mills do need some help. The manpower problem is one that is causing them more grief than possibly any other question.

Mr. VANDENBERG. It is my understanding that the objection on the part of the private operators is not to subsidizing the smaller operators. I understand that feature of the plan is approved. But the question that is raised in the communications that have come to me is that that project in its pending form is so broad in the authority which it extends to the Forest Service that—to quote from one of the protests—

If the Forest Service so decides, and to any extent that it wishes for which it can secure the funds, it may—

(a) Buy, build, lease or transfer, or operate mills and plants for the production of forest products—logs, lumber, pulp paper—even tannin extract.

(b) Produce, buy, store, and sell forest products.

(c) Subsidize "submarginal production" of forest products.

(d) Arrange for the requisitioning, commandeering, and allotting of privately owned timber and plants which are regarded by the Forest Service as not "satisfactory operations" or as "recalcitrant."

Which would indicate that the power might even be used for punitive purposes.

Am I to understand that the Truman committee is willing to leave wide open



the determination of the extension of that tremendous power to the Forest Service?

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I think the statement referred to by the Senator from Michigan somewhat exaggerates the powers which have been given to the Forest Service. The Forest Service plan gives the necessary power to increase the production of lumber to the point where there will not be a shortage. The President has not signed an Executive order. The committee did not go on record as approving the plan or disapproving it. The plan was approved by the War Production Board; it was approved by the Forest Service; and it is up to the President now to decide whether or not it should be put into effect. It is our opinion that some drastic step must be taken in order to get enough lumber to meet the prospective shortage next year.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. If the Senator will permit me a moment further, I will conclude. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a brief memorandum of objections to the forest plan as submitted by Mr. M. L. Fleishel, chairman of the Lumber and Timber Products War Committee with headquarters in Washington. I do not vouch for the validity of his point of view; I know nothing about it; I am simply presenting it for what it may be worth.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to printing the memorandum in the RECORD?

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### OBJECTIONS TO PLAN FOR A GENERAL FOREST PRODUCTS PROGRAM OF UNITED STATES FOREST SERVICE

##### A. GENERAL OBJECTIONS

1. The provisions of the plan are indicative of a purpose to enable the Forest Service itself to engage in the production, purchase, storage, and sale of timber products rather than simply to facilitate the production and sale of such products for needed war uses by existing mills which already have ample capacity. We are, of course, aware of the long-standing desire of the Forest Service, first, itself to engage in logging and milling operations on the national forests, and second, more recently to establish a Federal control over local forest-cutting and forest-management practices. These are questions of long-time national policy. They are controversial and explosive issues. They have no connection with war production. They can wait and should wait.

2. These industries belong to the effort of the Forest Service to secure in the guise of a war-production program a general authorization to go into the lumber business and to establish Federal forestry controls. If the Forest Service thinks that many small mills which otherwise would be producing war products are now unable to operate because of lack of financing and lack of knowledge of markets, and if it intends simply to facilitate such production through Commodity Credit Corporation loans and advances, and through market information, it should limit accordingly its request for additional authority. It should not be seeking these broad and ambiguous powers which mean, or appear to mean, that if the Forest Service so decides, and to any extent that it wishes for which it can secure the funds, it may:

(a) Buy, build, lease, or transfer, or operate mills and plants for the production of forest products—logs, lumber, pulp paper—even tannin extract.

(b) Produce, buy, store, and sell forest products.

(c) Subsidize "submarginal production" of forest products.

(d) Arrange for the requisitioning, commandeering, and allotting of privately owned timber and plants which are regarded by the Forest Service as not "satisfactory operations" or as "recalcitrant."

These involve fundamental interests going far beyond the claimed simple objectives of the Forest Products Service plan, to facilitate additional production of lumber for necessary war purposes.

##### B. SPECIFIC OBJECTIONS

1. Referring to the Plan for a General Forest Products Program as submitted to the Senate (Truman) committee on October 25, 1942, the following comments refer to specified provisions of the agreement between the Secretary of Agriculture and the Chairman of the War Production Board stated to have been signed on November 20, 1942, and included in the Senate committee hearings record.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALLGREN. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. I think it should be said in answer to the statement made by the Senator from Michigan (Mr. VANDENBERG), that the Executive order which is on the President's desk has not been submitted to the Truman committee. There was a general discussion of its scope. The Forestry Service originally proposed not only an allocation of \$100,000,000 for financing the production of lumber but also that it should have extended power over forest practices. It was the latter suggestion which aroused the most concern. It is our understanding that was eliminated from the plan as finally approved by the War Production Board and submitted to the President. It may well be that with the \$100,000,000 authorization there will be granted such powers as are pointed out in the memorandum to which the Senator has referred; but if the power is to be denied because it may be abused, then government must cease, as, I think, was stated here by the late Senator Walsh of Montana some years ago.

It may be that the Executive order will authorize the Forest Service to go to the extent mentioned, but I am very sure it is not contemplated. I think the contemplation is simply that the \$100,000,000 shall be used to produce lumber. Whether any who have ideas of social and economic revolution will use such powers for purposes beyond the contemplation of those who serve on the Truman committee, of course, is always open to question; but I think that the Truman committee was entirely warranted in not making a finding on a plan which was not before it in detail and which had been under discussion for 8 months between the Forest Service and the War Production Board. This delay was most unfortunate. Decision is the chief requisite in time of war. "Better one bad general than two good generals."

Mr. WALLGREN. Mr. President, I should like to read to the Senator from

Michigan from the report a statement which I think will cover his question. It is as follows:

The advantages which are expected to be gained by placing the plan in operation are important. It is expected to increase production by utilizing the capacity of small mills, now only partially used, through providing firm markets, credit facilities, equipment and material, and knowledge of Government procedure, and through making available labor, particularly agricultural labor, during the off season.

Another advantage cited for the plan is the stimulation of the production of increased quantities of cordwood to provide an important source of fuel, in at least some of the areas where the fuel shortage is expected to be most severe. This is particularly true of the New England area.

Both the War Production Board and the Department of Agriculture are now in agreement that the plan with modifications should be adopted and the committee believes that the determination of the desirability of such action should be left to the experts experienced in such matters, especially where, as here, the two agencies are in agreement.

However, the committee has received many complaints with respect to some of the provisions of the plan, and believes that the program, if improperly or carelessly carried out, which it is assumed will not be the case, could effect considerable damage. The expressed purpose of the plan is to supplement present production and stimulate increased production without bringing the Government into competition with industry or existing lumbering operations which are already producing satisfactory results. Great care should be taken to assure that this objective is met and that we do not, in the operation of the plan, destroy as much or more as we create.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALLGREN. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Florida is very vitally affected by the proposal of the Forestry Service which is under discussion, and the lumber industry of that State has been particularly articulate in the expression of its opposition to the proposed plan. Mr. Fleishel, whose letter the able Senator from Michigan has just put in the RECORD and referred to, is one of the principal lumbermen of this country and one of the most responsible. I gladly attest his reliability and his information. He is in the official position as the head of the lumber industry under the War Production Board which is noted in the letter, the details of which the able Senator from Michigan read.

I have been in Florida and I have talked to some of the lumber industry personally about this matter. Their feeling is that which was indicated by the able Senator from Michigan. It is also my feeling, that, insofar as this plan provides a way whereby the woodlot farmers, the small sawmill, the small citizen may more effectively help the war effort, I am for it; but, insofar as it proposes a re-vamping of the whole forestry system of the United States and to convey the power to take over any sawmill or lumber operation, whatever may be its size or efficiency, provided the administrative agency thinks it would be better if it were owned by the public than by its present owner, whether a corporation or company

or person, it grants authority to which I could not feel free to subscribe.

Mr. President, I do not mind saying that I have personally protested to the President, through Mr. Marvin McIntyre, against signing the report, and I hope the President will not sign it. I am pleased that the Truman committee, with its great prestige, has not recommended the signing of the report in question.

My recommendation to the President, if I may refer to it, was that the matter be restudied, reexamined, and whatever needed authority should be conveyed be provided, and excessive authority be deleted. The lumber industry takes the position that under the Smaller War Plants Corporation there is already in the Government power to help an industry which does not have the money to enable it to go into war production, to make such conversion, and the industry does not see why it is particularly necessary to set up another corporation or another authority to do what the Smaller War Plants Corporation is already authorized and has the money to do. The industry says furthermore that the Forest Service already has considerable authority with respect to forestry practices, and that it is not necessary to revamp the forestry plan by this particular procedure.

So I think the recommendation requires a reexamination, and to say the least, the stripping from the plan of the powers which I think the industry has a right to complain about, and the limiting of the authority conferred only to what may be necessary in furtherance of the war effort.

Mr. WALLGREN. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Florida that the testimony given before the committee indicated that the acute shortage at the present time is in the heavy dimension timbers, and not in such timber as is being supplied by the smaller mills.

Mr. PEPPER. If that is where the real shortage is, then probably that power which we thought may be simply an appendage may become the power the agencies are really trying to obtain, that is, to take some of the larger sawmills under control, on the theory that it would be better if they were owned by the public than by their present owners.

Mr. WALLGREN. It is the smaller mills, of course, that are furnishing the smaller dimension timber. It is my personal opinion that the plan should not go through.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Did the Senator from Washington just say that it was his personal opinion that the plan should not go through?

Mr. WALLGREN. That is my personal opinion.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That makes at least three of us then who feel that way.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALLGREN. I yield.

Mr. ANDREWS. Does the Senator from Washington know whether the order has been signed, or is it still lying unsigned on the desk of the President?

Mr. WALLGREN. It is my understanding that it is on the desk of the

President, unsigned. It has been there for some time.

Mr. ANDREWS. Many of us have asked that it be not signed, and we hope its signing will be suspended until the matter can be gone into by the Senator's committee.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALLGREN. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish to express the same opinion the Senators from Florida have expressed. The people of South Carolina are quite upset about the proposed order, and on their behalf I protest against it. I entirely agree with the statement made by the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER.]

#### ADJOURNMENT OF SEVENTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS SINE DIE

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a privileged resolution which I ask to have read and agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TRUMAN in the chair). The concurrent resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 41), as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the two Houses of Congress shall adjourn on Wednesday, the 16th day of December 1942, and that when they adjourn on said day they stand adjourned sine die.*

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I have no objection to the concurrent resolution; indeed, I am in favor of its adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution?

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

#### AUTHORIZATION TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS AFTER THE ADJOURNMENT OF CONGRESS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk another concurrent resolution, which I ask to have read and agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 42) as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That notwithstanding the adjournment of the second session of the Seventy-seventh Congress, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives be, and they are hereby, authorized to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses which have been examined by the Committee on Enrolled Bills of each House and found truly enrolled.*

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution?

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

#### AMENDMENT OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate

consideration of House bill 7370, Calendar No. 1890.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I rise to announce at this time that in view of the concurrent resolution just adopted providing for sine die adjournment tomorrow, I think we should very carefully scrutinize the bills which we are asked to consider, and I shall object to consideration of any Senate bill, or any bill of controversial nature which must go to the House for its consideration. The able Senator from Montana has explained the general purposes of the bill to me, and I shall make an exception in the case of this bill, and not object to it.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, as I understand, the Senator from Oregon is not going to object?

Mr. McNARY. No. I stated I make an exception in this instance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 7370) to authorize, during time of war, waiver of compliance with or modification or suspension of the operation of certain provisions of the Communications Act of 1934.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, the Navy is very anxious to have the bill passed. The House has passed the bill. It came to the Senate and was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce and was amended in that committee. The bill provides for relaxing some of the safety provisions contained in rules and regulations governing radio. These provisions are considered absolutely necessary in time of peace, but in time of war the Navy Department feels that if it were to permit the continuation of certain practices, and could not change them by rules and regulations, it would result in giving to the enemy information which the Department does not want the enemy to have.

I shall read three subsections of the Senate amendment of section 1 of the bill, as follows:

(1) Section 201 (b) of the act shall not be construed as permitting or requiring the furnishing of reports of the positions of ships by common carriers subject to provisions of this act; such reports may be furnished by such common carriers only pursuant to such rules and regulations as may be promulgated by the Secretary of the Navy;

(2) Section 306 shall not be construed to permit the transmission of communications or signals by a foreign ship when the same is within the jurisdiction of the United States except pursuant to such rules and regulations as may be promulgated by the Secretary of the Navy;

(3) Section 318 shall not be construed as preventing the emergency or temporary operation of the transmitting apparatus of radio stations for which licensed operators are required by international agreement or for safety purposes by any member of the armed forces of the United States, or upon aircraft by any person pursuant to direction of the military and naval authorities of the United States.

Mr. President, the changes provided are particularly important to the Navy at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?



Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I wish to request the able Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] to make a brief statement concerning the bill. He has given particular consideration to the matter.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I shall be glad to have the Senator from Maine make a statement. I may add that when the bill came to the Interstate Commerce Committee the Senator from Maine, in consultation with officials of the Navy Department, worked out the provisions now contained in it. I may say that the safety provisions were originally written into the law almost entirely by the distinguished senior Senator from Maine.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I am glad to say a brief word of concurrence in all that the Senator from Montana has said, except as to my responsibility for the original provisions of law. The Senator has been most kind in his references to me. The bill as it came from the House was very general in its terms. It constituted a blanket authority to the President, or to whoever the President might name, to modify, or to waive, or to suspend provisions which have been written into our law designed to make for the safety of our ships and the safety of the personnel upon our ships, so far as radio communication might affect those matters. We in the committee felt it highly desirable that, instead of this general authority, there should be particular authority, and above all else we felt that the respects in which the provisions of law might be modified or suspended or amended should be set out in the committee amendment, and that is done.

I myself feel that it is highly necessary that the proposed legislation be passed. I should hate to take the responsibility for what might result from withholding of this authority from the Navy at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 7370) to authorize, during time of war, waiver of compliance with or modification or suspension of the operation of certain provisions of the Communications Act of 1934, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate Commerce with an amendment on page 1, after line 6, to strike out:

(h) During the continuance of a war in which the United States is engaged, the President, or any agency or officer of the United States designated by him for such purpose, may, to such extent and in such manner and upon such terms as the President or such agency or officer may prescribe as necessary for the national security and defense, by order waive compliance with or modify or suspend the operation of, in whole or in part, the provisions of the last proviso of section 201 (b), the provisions of section 306, the provisions of clauses (1) and (2) of the first proviso of section 318, and the provisions of sections 321, 322, 323, 324, 351, 352, and 357 of this act. No such order shall continue in effect after a period ending not later than 6 months after the termination of such war

or such earlier date as the Congress by concurrent resolution may designate.

And to insert in lieu thereof the following:

(h) During the continuance of the war in which the United States is now engaged and for a period ending not later than 6 months after the termination of such war or such earlier date as the Congress by concurrent resolution may designate—

(1) Section 201 (b) of the act shall not be construed as permitting or requiring the furnishing of reports of the positions of ships by common carriers subject to provisions of this act; such reports may be furnished by such common carriers only pursuant to such rules and regulations as may be promulgated by the Secretary of the Navy;

(2) Section 306 shall not be construed to permit the transmission of communications or signals by a foreign ship when the same is within the jurisdiction of the United States except pursuant to such rules and regulations as may be promulgated by the Secretary of the Navy;

(3) Section 318 shall not be construed as preventing the emergency or temporary operation of the transmitting apparatus of radio stations for which licensed operators are required by international agreement or for safety purposes by any member of the armed forces of the United States, or upon aircraft by any person pursuant to direction of the military and naval authorities of the United States;

(4) Section 321 (b) shall not be construed as establishing any priority for distress messages over military message traffic determined by the Secretary of the Navy to require priority in transmission in the effective prosecution of the war;

(5) Intercommunication by radio stations in the mobile service as provided for in section 322 shall be conducted only in such manner and at such times as may be authorized by the Secretary of the Navy;

(6) Nothing contained in part II of title III of the act shall be construed as preventing the military and naval authorities of the United States from ordering the emergency movement of ships at such times and under such circumstances as they may deem necessary in the effective prosecution of the war.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to further insure the protection of vessels in wartime by amending the Communications Act of 1934, as amended."

#### CLARIFICATION OF MERCHANT MARINE LAWS

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I move—and I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY]—that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 7424, to amend and clarify certain provisions of law relating to functions of the War Shipping Administration, and for other purposes. It is Calendar No. 1865. I heard what the Senator from Oregon said when consideration of a previous bill was asked. My regard for the Senator is such that I would not insist unduly on my motion if the Senator from Oregon feels that the proposed legis-

lation should go over to the next session, and therefore feels that he would be justified in objecting to the Senate considering it now. I will say to the Senator that the bill contains several amendments, and, therefore, it would have to go to the House for further consideration. It would not do to pass the bill without one of the amendments. There is some objection to another amendment which I shall be glad to move to strike out. There may be other objections to the bill. I am trying to be frank with the Senator from Oregon in saying that I wish to discharge my duty by moving that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the proposed legislation, and if the Senator objects I shall not insist upon the motion.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I am delighted at the courtesy shown me by the distinguished Senator from North Carolina. I discussed the matter with the Senator some weeks ago, and recently with the able Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE]. I thought at the time it was understood that the bill would go back to the Committee on Commerce, of which the Senator from North Carolina is chairman, and be considered early in the next session of the Congress. There is some opposition to the bill. As a member of the committee, I have received telegrams concerning the bill. In view of the fact that amendments to the bill must be considered by the House, it could not be passed by the House at this time. Personally, I think it should be returned to the Committee on Commerce for further consideration.

Mr. BAILEY. It is a House bill. It came to the Senate, and was referred to the Committee on Commerce. It was reported from the committee to the Senate, and then upon my motion was recommitted to the committee, and has now again been reported to the Senate.

Mr. McNARY. Yes, and it now contains language which would have to be considered by the House.

Mr. BAILEY. Yes. There is one amendment which would have to go to the House for its consideration.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I think that measure falls within the rule for my personal action, which I attempted to promulgate. The Senator from North Carolina places me in an embarrassing position by moving to take the bill up for consideration, which he has a right to do, and I have not control over that. If the Senator had asked unanimous consent for consideration of the bill I should have politely objected. I shall object if the Senator puts the matter in the form of a unanimous-consent request, because I know the bill cannot be passed by the House at this session. I think it should be further considered by the committee.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I said I would not press my motion if the Senator from Oregon should object, and I think the Senator has objected. Now I take it the bill can go over. I dislike to delay.

Mr. McNARY. I do also.

Mr. BAILEY. But I am not prepared to say that delay would be fatal.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I regret the delay in many ways, but I think that by reason of delay better provisions will come out than are now contained in the bill. I shall cooperate with the able Senator from North Carolina to have early consideration of the measure on the floor, and I am sure we can get the assistance of our very distinguished majority leader to help us in January.

Mr. BAILEY. I would insist on my motion, Mr. President, but for the fact that the bill contains an amendment which must go to the House. I agree that the position taken by the Senator from Oregon is reasonable, and I have really no objection to the measure going over. So I shall withdraw the motion.

#### WARTIME HIGHWAY TRAFFIC PROGRAM

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, one of the most crucial problems confronting our country in these difficult wartimes is the maintenance of adequate transportation. It is now recognized that this can be done only if we keep in operation the great bulk of our 27,000,000 passenger cars and some 5,000,000 commercial vehicles, including busses. I believe that the sure way is for agencies of government to utilize to a greater degree the facilities and services of great national organizations which are ready and willing to help do the job. These organizations stand ready to increase their contribution to the war effort and our civilian life by developing public acceptance and public understanding of wartime problems and wartime restrictions.

Recently there has come to my attention the wartime highway traffic program, sponsored by 25 national organizations. It offers a pattern whereby every citizen can have an active part in the heroic struggle in which we are now engaged. It represents a fine example of the American way through the mobilization of millions of citizens behind objectives for the common good.

This wartime highway traffic program—a shift to war needs of peacetime activities based on experience in 5 years of practical application of methods for saving life and property—has been approved by the President of the United States; the Director of Defense Transportation, Joseph B. Eastman; the Rubber Director, William M. Jeffers; the Chairman of the Highway Traffic Advisory Committee to the War Department, Thomas H. MacDonald; the Chief of Transportation Corps, United States Army, Maj. Gen. Charles P. Gross; the Price Administrator, Leon Henderson; and the Chairman of the War Production Board, Donald M. Nelson.

The 25 national organizations supporting this program, through the Automotive Safety Foundation, recognize, first, that our highway transportation system must be stripped of all nonessentials and dedicated to winning the war, and, second, that essential highway transportation is a vital part of our Nation's war effort, and therefore pledge their whole-

hearted support to the conservation and efficient utilization of these facilities.

In view of our great interest in the traffic problem, including the safety aspects, at a time when we must conserve irreplaceable manpower and property, I commend the Wartime Highway Traffic Program to the Congress. I also ask unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as part of my remarks a brief summary of the objectives, method of achievement, the recommended program, and a list of the 25 sponsoring organizations.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### WARTIME HIGHWAY TRAFFIC PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

1. Conservation of the current critical stock of vehicles, tires, and roadways.
2. Conservation of man-hours and manpower through accident prevention.
3. Most efficient use of roads and vehicles for essential transportation.

#### METHOD OF ACHIEVEMENT

1. Official agencies, Federal, State, and local, to coordinate and carry out entire program, each maintaining sufficient personnel to discharge its vital responsibility.
2. Cooperation of nongovernmental organizations to mobilize public participation and support.

#### RECOMMENDED PROGRAM

1. Legislative action:
  - A. Create, finance, and define authority of State traffic coordinating body.
  - B. Enact such provisions of uniform vehicle code and such supplementary regulations as are necessary to meet emergency conditions.
  - C. Eliminate arbitrary barriers to war traffic at State lines.
  - D. Create by statute authority for use of chemical tests for intoxication.
  - E. Appropriate adequate funds for police, highway, motor vehicle, and other essential war traffic agencies.
2. Motor-vehicle administration:
  - A. Collect and analyze accident records to uncover emergency traffic disruptions, and make the data available to proper officials for action.
  - B. Step up suspension and revocation of licenses of bad-record drivers to conserve war manpower.
  - C. Use driver examinations and reexaminations to meet war traffic needs.
  - D. Maintain bus and truck inventories for military and other emergency uses.
  - E. Inspect tires and vehicles to insure maximum use.
3. Police control:
  - A. Adapt traffic law enforcement to meet special needs of military and war-production areas.
  - B. Secure observance of rubber emergency speed limit.
  - C. Prevent vehicle overloading to conserve vehicles, tires, and highways.
  - D. Meet enforcement needs of black-out, dim-out, and other war hazards.
  - E. Develop cooperation of police and courts with military authorities on traffic violations by military personnel.
  - F. Cooperate in emergency law enforcement program with prosecutors, judges, and driver license departments.
4. Engineering:
  - A. Designate preferred and alternate routes to facilitate essential traffic.
  - B. Adapt signs, signals, and markers to war traffic needs.

- C. Construct essential access roads.
- D. Make minor construction improvements to increase efficiency and safety of war traffic roads.
- E. Maintain essential thoroughfares.
- F. Conduct surveys and prepare detailed plans for staggered working, shopping, and school hours.
- G. Increase mass transportation efficiency through rerouting, rescheduling, fewer stops, elimination of duplicate services.
5. Public participation:
  - A. Eliminate nonessential vehicle use.
  - B. Stagger working, shopping, and school hours to reduce peak-hour congestion on highways and public carriers.
  - C. Share cars, revise shopping habits, and adjust commercial vehicle operations to conserve tires, vehicles, and fuel.
  - D. Improve vehicle and tire maintenance.
  - E. Improve driving habits for conservation and safety.
  - F. Walk more and walk safely.
  - G. Reduce driving speeds for conservation. Observe rubber emergency speed limit.
  - H. Enlist children's cooperation in wartime traffic program.
6. Training:
  - A. Train Army, school bus, truck and bus, and emergency vehicle drivers to meet war traffic conditions.
  - B. Train high-school drivers for future military and essential civilian needs.
  - C. Train regular and replacement, auxiliary and military police in traffic control.
  - D. Train other essential war traffic personnel.

#### SUPPORTING ORGANIZATIONS

American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators.  
American Association of State Highway Officials.  
American Automobile Association.  
American Federation of Labor.  
American Legion.  
American Mutual Alliance.  
American Transit Association.  
American Trucking Associations, Inc.  
Automotive Safety Foundation.  
Boy Scouts of America.  
Center for Safety Education.  
Congress of Industrial Organizations.  
Highway Education Board.  
Institute of Traffic Engineers.  
International Association of Chiefs of Police.  
Kiwanis International.  
National Association of Motor Bus Operators.  
National Congress of Parents and Teachers.  
National Conservation Bureau.  
National Farmers Union.  
National Grange.  
National Safety Council.  
Northwestern University.  
United States Junior Chamber of Commerce.  
Yale Bureau for Street Traffic Research.

#### ADJUSTMENT OF SALARIES OF METROPOLITAN POLICE FORCE, ETC.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 6386, Calendar No. 1526.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 6386) to provide for an adjustment of salaries of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and the members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, to



conform with the increased cost of living in the District of Columbia, and also to conform with wages paid in many cities of the Nation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I assume that the bill is a companion measure to the joint resolution passed today, which was sponsored by the able Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], and has the same general purposes.

Mr. McCARRAN. It involves the same principle. The measure sponsored by the Senator from New York did not take into consideration the Fire or Police Departments of the District of Columbia. The employees, officers, and privates of the Police and Fire Departments of the District of Columbia have had no consideration given them in any bill which has been before the Congress up to the present time.

Mr. McNARY. Has the bill the unanimous approval of the Committee on the District of Columbia?

Mr. McCARRAN. It has the unanimous approval of the committee, and it has passed the House. I will state frankly to the able Senator from Oregon that it does not have the approval of the District Commissioners.

Mr. McNARY. Does that statement apply to all of the Commissioners?

Mr. McCARRAN. I cannot answer with regard to the unanimity of view. I only know that they reported adversely to my committee. I desire to clear the atmosphere for the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. McNARY. I appreciate the fairness of the able Senator from Nevada.

Mr. McCARRAN. However, the Committee on the District of Columbia were unanimous in reporting the bill favorably as it came over from the House.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Did the District Commissioners appear before the committee and make their position known to the committee?

Mr. McCARRAN. They not only appeared before the committee but also submitted a letter which dealt with the matter and set forth in detail the reasons for their opposition to the bill.

Mr. McNARY. Will the able Senator from Nevada state briefly their criticism in objecting to the bill?

Mr. McCARRAN. I shall be glad to do so. I believe it would be better and more frank if I should read the letter.

Mr. McNARY. Is it a question of inability to acquire the money without further taxation, or something of that kind?

Mr. McCARRAN. Speaking from memory, I will say that the Commissioners opposed it because they thought the increase would be too great a burden on the taxpayers of the District. However, let me say in response to that, as we said to the Commissioners when they appeared before the committee, that, from

the standpoint of fire hazard and the difficulty in retaining officers and men in the Police and Fire Departments, the employees of the District to whom reference has been made are carrying the greatest burden they have ever carried in all their history. The departments have been losing daily men who have gone into the military service and the better-paid activities of civil life. The Commissioners merely said that they did not believe an increase in salaries should be added as an additional burden on the taxpayers. That is the purport of their letter.

Mr. McNARY. In view of the statement of the able Senator from Nevada, I have no objection to the bill.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. When the Commissioners appeared before the committee my position was that the bill should not be passed in advance of legislation which would increase the pay of other Federal employees. I opposed the bill on that ground, feeling that if it were passed there would be a demand for an increase of \$300 a year for all the District employees as well as for all other Federal employees. However, in view of the steps which have now been taken to increase the pay of all employees of the Federal Government in amounts as high as \$290 a year, I believe that the proposed legislation is now justified and in line with proper treatment of other Federal employees.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator has accurately stated his own position. It was with that in mind that I held back this bill, awaiting action with respect to other Federal employees.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. Will the able Senator from Nevada state the percentage of increase in salaries which would result from the passage of the bill?

Mr. McCARRAN. The percentage varies with varying salaries. It would vary from about 8 percent to 10 or 10½ percent, if I recall correctly, but the greatest increase would be only \$300 a year in any one salary.

Mr. BYRD. That would give a policeman with the rank of private a salary of \$2,000 a year?

Mr. McCARRAN. The bill would provide that from now on a newly employed private would start at a base salary of \$2,000 a year.

Mr. BYRD. And he would receive an annual increase of \$140 a year.

Mr. McCARRAN. Until he arrived at a yearly salary of \$2,400.

Mr. BYRD. And that would be the limit for a private.

Mr. McCARRAN. That would be the limit.

Mr. BYRD. He receives no overtime pay.

Mr. McCARRAN. He receives no overtime pay whatever. No employees of the Government of whom I have any knowledge are called upon to put in

more overtime than are the employees of the Fire Department and the Police Department of the District of Columbia. There is no such thing as time off for a fireman or a policeman in the District. He is always subject to call.

Mr. BYRD. Why did the District Commissioners oppose the bill? It seems to me that a salary of \$2,000 for a policeman is not unreasonable. Will the able Senator from Nevada read the particular part of the letter to which he has referred showing why the Commissioners opposed the increase in pay?

Mr. McCARRAN. I will read the entire letter. I think it clearly states the position of the Commissioners:

GOVERNMENT OF THE  
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,  
OFFICE OF THE BUDGET,  
June 3, 1942.

Mr. R. F. CAMALIER,  
Counsel, United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Replying to your request, the following statement is submitted for your information:

Prior to the act of March 4, 1923 (Public, No. 516, 67th Cong.), usually referred to as the Classification Act of 1923, administrative employees of the District Government were paid in accordance with the prevailing practice at that time, namely, at statutory rates expressly provided in the annual appropriation acts.

With the institution of grades and salary schedules provided by the act mentioned above, appropriate grades were determined in accordance with the work performed, and the salaries fixed in conformity thereto.

Subsequently certain inequities in the salaries originally fixed by the act of March 4, 1923, were recognized and amendments followed at irregular intervals. The act of May 28, 1928 (Public, No. 555, 70th Cong.), commonly called the Welch Act; the act of July 3, 1930 (Public, No. 523, 71st Cong.), known as the Brookhart Act; and the act of August 1, 1941 (Public Law 200, 77th Cong.), and known as the Mead-Ramspeck Act, are the specific acts referred to. The last-named act did not make any salary adjustments in the wage scale; it was restricted to providing the machinery whereby administrative within-grade salary increases could be obtained by employees subject to the provisions of the Classification Act.

The attached table shows the grades encompassed and the salary ranges, minimum and maximum only, with the changes reflected as a result of the amendments mentioned above.

It is not remiss to mention the fact that in comparison with such employees in the District service as the police and firemen, as well as school teachers, who are compensated under different provisions, the administrative employees enjoy no automatic salary increase feature.

With the exception of those members of the uniformed forces who are sergeants or above, the initial salary rate is \$1,900 per annum, with an annual automatic increase of \$100 until the maximum of \$2,400 is attained. Sergeants, lieutenants, and captains in the police department receive compensation at the rate of \$2,750, \$3,050, and \$3,600 per annum, respectively. In the fire department sergeants, lieutenants, and captains are paid at the rate of \$2,600, \$2,840, and \$3,000 per annum, respectively. The basic pay of teachers in the elementary schools is \$1,400 per annum, with an annual automatic increase of \$100 until the maximum of \$2,200 is attained.

Teachers in the junior and senior high schools enjoy similar features at correspondingly higher rates. By virtue of provisions under the Teacher's Salary Act salary grades are established in higher levels which make it possible for a teacher meeting the requirements to attain a still greater compensation.

On the other hand, no such automatic provision exists for administrative employees to receive periodic increases. Even the liberalized provisions of the Mead-Ramspeck Act require the attainment of an appropriate efficiency rating and manifest a satisfactory working attitude plus the stipulated period of service before being eligible to obtain a within-grade increase. This act referred to did abolish a very serious barrier to such increases when the so-called "average salary rate of the grade" prohibition was removed thereby.

As a further evidence of the beneficial provisions now applicable to members of the uniformed forces, the following instances are cited for your information.

Policemen and firemen are entitled to the same annual-leave benefits as the administrative employees, but are entitled to unlimited sick leave which is restricted with respect to the latter.

The uniformed forces receive complete medical service for which no charge is made.

This group also is furnished with uniforms and supplemental equipment and further enjoys an annual allotment for replacements to worn and damaged uniforms.

Recognition has been accorded the hazardous nature of the calling by permitting supplemental increments or bonuses such as the following: \$120 per annum for motorcycle policemen, \$240 per annum for precinct detectives, and \$600 per annum for detective sergeants, the latter two items are in addition to the salary received as a private. In the Fire Department, a provision which makes possible the payment of an additional \$60 per annum to privates and sergeants exists. In brief, this situation permits the administrative officers of the Fire Department to select 10 percent of the privates and sergeants, respectively, who have rendered outstandingly efficient service during the year for this financial recognition. Such selection is made from the men highest on the promotion lists, and serves as an added incentive for excellent service.

At the present time a deduction of 3½ percent only is withheld from the salaries of members of the uniformed force, but they are permitted to retire on one-half pay. Administrative employees now by law will be required to increase their contribution to the retirement fund from 3½ percent to 5 percent of their salaries and the annuity computed on the basis of service with the rate established over a 5-year period of the highest earning capacity.

In addition to the foregoing, the widows and children of police and firemen are granted a pension of \$50 per month for the widows and \$10 per month for each child until the child reaches the age of 16. No such benefit inures to the families of administrative employees whether killed in line of duty or not.

The foregoing statements are intended to convey the thought that a more liberal policy with respect to salary and other employment features has been applied to school teachers and members of the uniformed forces of the District service than has been the case with respect to the administrative employees. This situation becomes immediately apparent when we examine the average salaries of these groups. The school teachers average approximately \$2,300 per annum, the uniformed force approximately \$2,350 per annum, while the administrative group only average approximately \$1,800 per annum. It is perhaps

significant that the uniformed group represents the highest paid group of employees in the District service.

Very sincerely yours,  
WALTER L. FOWLER,  
Budget Officer, District of Columbia.

Grade	Classification Act		Welch Act		Brookhart Act		Mead-Ramspeck Act
	From	To	From	To	From	To	
Prof.-1	Dol.	Dol.	Dol.	Dol.	Dol.	Dol.	
	1,860	2,400	2,000	2,500	2,000	2,600	\$100 steps.
	2,400	3,000	2,600	3,100	2,600	3,200	Do.
	3,000	3,600	3,200	3,700	3,200	3,800	Do.
	3,600	4,200	3,800	4,400	3,800	4,400	\$200 steps.
	4,200	4,800	4,400	5,000	4,400	5,000	Do.
	4,800	5,400	5,000	5,600	5,000	5,600	Do.
	5,400	6,000	5,600	6,200	5,600	6,200	\$250 steps.
SP-1	6,000	7,500	6,200	7,500	6,200	7,500	Do.
	7,500	8,000	7,500	8,000	7,500	8,000	\$50 steps.
	8,000	1,260	1,020	1,320	1,020	1,380	Do.
	1,260	1,500	1,260	1,500	1,260	1,500	Do.
	1,500	1,680	1,440	1,740	1,440	1,800	Do.
	1,680	1,860	1,620	1,920	1,620	1,980	Do.
	1,860	2,040	1,800	2,100	1,800	2,160	Do.
	2,040	2,400	2,000	2,500	2,000	2,600	\$100 steps.
CAF-1	2,400	2,700	2,300	2,800	2,300	2,900	Do.
	2,700	3,000	2,600	3,100	2,600	3,200	Do.
	3,000	3,300	2,900	3,400	2,900	3,500	\$50 steps.
	3,300	3,600	3,200	3,700	3,200	3,800	Do.
	3,600	3,900	3,500	4,000	3,500	4,100	Do.
	3,900	4,200	3,800	4,400	3,800	4,600	\$200 steps.
	4,200	4,500	4,000	4,500	4,000	4,500	Do.
	4,500	5,000	4,400	5,200	4,400	5,400	\$250 steps.
CU-1	5,000	5,500	4,800	5,300	4,800	5,300	Do.
	5,500	6,000	5,400	5,900	5,400	5,900	\$50 steps.
	6,000	7,500	6,200	7,500	6,200	7,500	Do.
	7,500	8,000	7,500	8,000	7,500	8,000	\$60 steps.
	8,000	8,400	8,000	8,400	8,000	8,400	Do.
	8,400	1,140	1,080	1,380	1,080	1,380	Do.
	1,140	1,260	1,200	1,500	1,200	1,500	Do.
	1,260	1,500	1,320	1,620	1,320	1,680	Do.
	1,500	1,680	1,500	1,800	1,500	1,860	Do.
	1,680	1,860	1,680	1,980	1,680	2,040	Do.
	1,860	2,040	1,860	2,200	1,860	2,300	\$60 and \$100 steps.
	2,040	2,400	2,000	2,500	2,000	2,600	\$100 steps.
	2,400	2,700	2,300	2,800	2,300	2,900	Do.
	2,700	3,000	2,600	3,100	2,600	3,200	Do.
	3,000	3,300	2,900	3,400	2,900	3,500	
	3,300	3,600	3,200	3,700	3,200	3,800	

The Mead-Ramspeck Act provided no increased salary rates, but did abolish the \$500 salary steps previously existing in the higher bracket grades.

Mr. President, let me say now that I think the letter sets forth the gravamen of the complaint laid against the bill by the Commissioners. To that letter the Committee on the District of Columbia made reply by its unanimous statement that the members of the Police Department of the District of Columbia had received no pay increase of any kind since 1930, and that the increase involved in the bill was so small and so insignificant, being at most only \$300 a year—that it was justified on the basis of a normal and natural increase in pay for very responsible public officials.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, I merely wish to inquire as to the teachers in the District of Columbia. I understand that neither the pending bill nor the pay resolution agreed to earlier in the day by the Senate provides for increasing their pay. Does the Senator from Nevada expect to make some provision for them either now or early in the next session?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I fully intend to try to make provision for the teachers in the District of Columbia at the next session. If provision for increasing their pay—

justified as it would be—were to be added to the provisions already contained in the pending bill, the bill would be lost before it possibly could get through, because of the concurrent resolution which we agreed to earlier today.

The measure is a meritorious one. It is in keeping with the necessity of the times; the need for it is brought on by the unusual conditions of today. I hope the bill will have no opposition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado in the chair). If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill H. R. 6386 was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### RULES FOR DISPLAY AND USE OF FLAG OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MCFARLAND. From the Committee on the Judiciary, I report favorably, with amendments, House Joint Resolution No. 359 and I submit a report (No. 1848) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 359) to amend Public Law 623, Seventy-seventh Congress, entitled "Joint resolution to codify and emphasize existing rules and customs pertaining to the display and use of the flag of the United States of America."

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, on June 22, 1942, Public Law No. 623 was approved by the President. Its purpose was to provide an authoritative guide to civilians who desire to use the flag correctly. The pending joint resolution, as amended, would amend the law in a number of particulars, and carries out changes suggested by the House Committee on the Judiciary. After the resolution passed the House it came to the Senate and was referred to the Senate Judiciary Committee.

In the interest of clarity, the numerous amendments contained in the House bill have been annotated by striking out all after the enacting clause and dovetailing into the text of Public Law No. 623 the amendments as passed by the House, so that this resolution, when approved by the President and printed as a law on the subject of the code of the flag of the United States, will be printed in one pamphlet.

Mr. President, this is done in order that the law may be printed and distributed for the benefit of those who desire all the information. I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be considered at this time.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I understand the Senator is asking for immediate consideration of the joint resolution, with amendments; is that correct?

Mr. MCFARLAND. That is correct. Let me say to the Senator from Oregon that the only amendment which is proposed is in the printing of the bill. It sets forth the whole law as amended;



and that is done merely in order that it may be printed as an entirety. No changes at all would be made in the law by following the process requested.

Mr. McNARY. No change is made in the substance of the act; is that correct?

Mr. McFARLAND. The substance of the act is changed to conform with House Joint Resolution No. 359.

Mr. McNARY. Would it require House action?

Mr. McFARLAND. It would require House action; yes.

Mr. McNARY. How is the Senator going to get that?

Mr. McFARLAND. It would require very simple House action. The Senate amendment does not make any change in the substance of the law. The amendment relates only to the matter which is set forth.

Mr. McNARY. That is what I desired to understand. No change or modification is now proposed in the act; is that correct?

Mr. McFARLAND. That is correct.

Mr. McNARY. Under that statement, I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 359) to amend Public Law 623, Seventy-seventh Congress, entitled "Joint resolution to codify and emphasize existing rules and customs pertaining to the display and use of the flag of the United States of America," which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That Public Law No. 623, approved June 22, 1942, entitled "Joint resolution to codify and emphasize existing rules and customs pertaining to the display and use of the flag of the United States of America", be, and the same is hereby amended to read as follows:

"That the following codification of existing rules and customs pertaining to the display and use of the flag of the United States of America be, and it is hereby, established for the use of such civilians or civilian groups or organizations as may not be required to conform with regulations promulgated by one or more executive departments of the Government of the United States.

"Sec. 2. (a) It is the universal custom to display the flag only from sunrise to sunset on buildings and on stationary flagstaves in the open. However, the flag may be displayed at night upon special occasions when it is desired to produce a patriotic effect.

"(b) The flag should be hoisted briskly and lowered ceremoniously.

"(c) The flag should not be displayed on days when the weather is inclement.

"(d) The flag should be displayed on all days when the weather permits, especially on New Year's Day, January 1; Inauguration Day, January 20; Lincoln's Birthday, February 12; Washington's Birthday, February 22; Army Day, April 6; Easter Sunday (variable); Mother's Day, second Sunday in May; Memorial Day (half staff until noon), May 30; Flag Day, June 14; Independence Day, July 4; Labor Day, first Monday in September; Constitution Day, September 17; Columbus Day, October 12; Navy Day, October 27; Armistice Day, November 11; Thanksgiving Day, fourth Thursday in November; Christmas Day, December 25; such other days as may be proclaimed by the President of the United

States; the birthdays of States (dates of admission); and on State holidays.

"(e) The flag should be displayed daily weather permitting, on or near the main administration building of every public institution.

"(f) The flag should be displayed in or near every polling place on election days.

"(g) The flag should be displayed during school days in or near every schoolhouse.

"Sec. 3. That the flag, when carried in a procession with another flag or flags, should be either on the marching right; that is, the flag's own right, or, if there is a line of other flags, in front of the center of that line.

"(a) The flag should not be displayed on a float in a parade except from a staff, or as provided in subsection (1).

"(b) The flag should not be draped over the hood, top, sides, or back of a vehicle or of a railroad train or a boat. When the flag is displayed on a motorcar, the staff shall be fixed firmly to the chassis or clamped to the radiator cap.

"(c) No other flag or pennant should be placed above or, if on the same level, to the right of the flag of the United States of America, except during church services conducted by naval chaplains at sea, when the church pennant may be flown above the flag during church services for the personnel of the Navy.

"(d) The flag of the United States of America, when it is displayed with another flag against a wall from crossed staffs, should be on the right, the flag's own right, and its staff should be in front of the staff of the other flag.

"(e) The flag of the United States of America should be at the center and at the highest point of the group when a number of flags of States or localities or pennants of societies are grouped and displayed from staffs.

"(f) When flags of States, cities, or localities, or pennants of societies are flown on the same halyard with the flag of the United States, the latter should always be at the peak. When the flags are flown from adjacent staffs, the flag of the United States should be hoisted first and lowered last. No such flag or pennant may be placed above the flag of the United States or to the right of the flag of the United States.

"(g) When flags of two or more nations are displayed, they are to be flown from separate staffs of the same height. The flags should be of approximately equal size. International usage forbids the display of the flag of one nation above that of another nation in time of peace.

"(h) When the flag of the United States is displayed from a staff projecting horizontally or at an angle from the window sill, balcony, or front of a building, the union of the flag should be placed at the peak of the staff unless the flag is at half staff. When the flag is suspended over a sidewalk from a rope extending from a house to a pole at the edge of the sidewalk, the flag should be hoisted out, union first, from the building.

"(i) When the flag is displayed otherwise than by being flown from a staff, it should be displayed flat, whether indoors or out, or so suspended that its folds fall as free as though the flag were staffed.

"(j) When the flag is displayed over the middle of the street, it should be suspended vertically with the union to the north in an east and west street or to the east in a north and south street.

"(k) When used on a speaker's platform, the flag, if displayed flat, should be displayed above and behind the speaker. When displayed from a staff in a church or public auditorium, if it is displayed in the chancel of a church, or on the speaker's platform in a public auditorium, the flag should occupy the position of honor and be placed at the clergyman's or speaker's right as he faces the congregation or audience. Any other flag so

displayed in the chancel or on the platform should be placed at the clergyman's or speaker's left as he faces the congregation or audience. But when the flag is displayed from a staff in a church or public auditorium elsewhere than in the chancel or on the platform it shall be placed in the position of honor at the right of the congregation or audience as they face the chancel or platform. Any other flag so displayed should be placed on the left of the congregation or audience as they face the chancel or platform.

"(l) The flag should form a distinctive feature of the ceremony of unveiling a statue or monument, but it should never be used as the covering for the statue or monument.

"(m) The flag, when flown at half staff, should be first hoisted to the peak for an instant and then lowered to the half-staff position. The flag should be again raised to the peak before it is lowered for the day. By 'half-staff' is meant lowering the flag to one-half the distance between the top and bottom of the staff. Crepe streamers may be affixed to spear heads or flagstaves in a parade only by order of the President of the United States.

"(n) When the flag is used to cover a casket it should be so placed that the union is at the head and over the left shoulder. The flag should not be lowered into the grave or allowed to touch the ground.

"Sec. 4. That no disrespect should be shown to the flag of the United States of America, the flag should not be dipped to any person or thing. Regimental colors, State flags, and organization or institutional flags are to be dipped as a mark of honor.

"(a) The flag should never be displayed with the union down save as a signal of dire distress.

"(b) The flag should never touch anything beneath it, such as the ground, the floor, water, or merchandise.

"(c) The flag should never be carried flat or horizontally, but always aloft and free.

"(d) The flag should never be used as drapery of any sort whatsoever, never festooned, drawn back, nor up, in folds, but always allowed to fall free. Bunting of blue, white, and red, always arranged with the blue above, the white in the middle, and the red below, should be used for covering a speaker's desk, draping the front of a platform, and for decoration in general.

"(e) The flag should never be fastened, displayed, used, or stored in such a manner as will permit it to be easily torn, soiled, or damaged in any way.

"(f) The flag should never be used as a covering for a ceiling.

"(g) The flag should never have placed upon it, nor on any part of it, nor attached to it any mark, insignia, letter, word, figure, design, picture, or drawing of any nature.

"(h) The flag should never be used as a receptacle for receiving, holding, carrying, or delivering anything.

"(i) The flag should never be used for advertising purposes in any manner whatsoever. It should not be embroidered on such articles as cushions or handkerchiefs and the like, printed or otherwise impressed on paper napkins or boxes or anything that is designed for temporary use and discard; or used as any portion of a costume or athletic uniform. Advertising signs should not be fastened to a staff or halyard from which the flag is flown.

"(j) The flag, when it is in such condition that it is no longer a fitting emblem for display, should be destroyed in a dignified way, preferably by burning.

"Sec. 5. That during the ceremony of hoisting or lowering the flag or when the flag is passing in a parade or in a review, all persons present should face the flag, stand at attention, and salute. Those present in uniform should render the military salute. When not in uniform, men should remove the headdress with the right hand holding

it at the left shoulder, the hand being over the heart. Men without hats should salute in the same manner. Aliens should stand at attention. Women should salute by placing the right hand over the heart. The salute to the flag in the moving column should be rendered at the moment the flag passes.

"Sec. 6. That when the national anthem is played and the flag is not displayed, all present should stand and face toward the music. Those in uniform should salute at the first note of the anthem, retaining this position until the last note. All others should stand at attention, men removing the headdress. When the flag is displayed, all present should face the flag and salute.

"Sec. 7. That the pledge of allegiance to the flag, 'I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one Nation indivisible, with liberty and justice for all,' be rendered by standing with the right hand over the heart. However, civilians will always show full respect to the flag when the pledge is given by merely standing at attention, men removing the headdress. Persons in uniform shall render the military salute.

"Sec. 8. Any rule or custom pertaining to the display of the flag of the United States of America, set forth herein, may be altered, modified, or repealed, or additional rules with respect thereto may be prescribed, by the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, whenever he deems it to be appropriate or desirable; and any such alteration or additional rule shall be set forth in a proclamation."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "Joint resolution to amend Public Law No. 623, approved June 22, 1942, entitled 'Joint resolution to codify and emphasize existing rules and customs pertaining to the display and use of the flag of the United States of America.'"

#### PREVENTION OF PRACTICES LEADING TO DENTAL DISORDERS

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1830, House bill 6730.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 6730) to protect the public health by the prevention of certain practices leading to dental disorders, and to prevent the circumvention of certain State or Territorial laws regulating the practice of dentistry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Minnesota for the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I wish to make a statement regarding the bill. If I correctly identify the bill, it is one to which I objected at the last call of the calendar. I did so at the request of an

absent Senator. At this time I understand that if the Senator at whose request I formerly objected were now present the objection would be withdrawn; so I have no objection to the present consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6730) to protect the public health by the prevention of certain practices leading to dental disorders; and to prevent the circumvention of certain State or Territorial laws regulating the practice of dentistry, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate Commerce, with an amendment, on page 2, line 15, after the word "dentistry," to strike out the comma and the words "or any matter advertising or soliciting orders for any denture so constructed or so to be constructed."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. ANDREWS subsequently said: Mr. President, a few minutes ago the Senate passed House bill 6730 dealing with the subject of dentistry. I should like to have the statement I now make inserted in the RECORD following the passage of the bill, in order that the RECORD may show the basic reason why the bill was thought to be necessary under all the circumstances.

I read from the report of the committee:

The Committee on Interstate Commerce to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 6730) to protect the public health by the prevention of certain practices leading to dental disorders; and to prevent the circumvention of certain State or territorial laws regulating the practice of dentistry, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendments and recommended that the same be adopted.

Under existing law, the public policy of every State which has enacted health statutes described in the bill can be violated without remedy. Even where two or more States are side by side and all have passed such laws, a violator living in one State escapes the penalty of his deeds in the neighboring State. This bill proposes to stop such transactions by making it a Federal offense to do in interstate transactions what is prohibited in intrastate transactions. This bill does not change the rights or regulate the acts of any citizen which are confined to his own State. It does not impose a new Federal policy on any State.

Its aims is to prevent frustration or evasion of State public health laws.

#### PURCHASE OF STEVENS HOTEL BY WAR DEPARTMENT

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter I have written to the Secretary of War, Hon. Henry L. Stimson, in which I asked for information with regard to the purchase by the

War Department of the Stevens Hotel at an announced price of \$6,000,000.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DECEMBER 15, 1942.

The Honorable HENRY L. STIMSON,  
The Secretary of War.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: My attention has been called to the fact that the War Department has purchased the Stevens Hotel in Chicago at a cost of \$6,000,000.

For years this hotel has been in financial difficulty, and the president of the hotel corporation has announced that the purchase price of \$6,000,000 is regarded as being very satisfactory by the security holders.

What concerns me, however, is the disposition of property such as this after the war. Can it be the purpose of the War Department, or the Government itself, to engage in the hotel business?

My observation has been that the Federal Government has never operated successfully, from a financial standpoint, a single activity of this character. In the program of resettlement projects, vast losses have occurred, and even now the loss in the operation of these projects above the income is \$1,600,000 annually. The same condition will result after the war if the Government undertakes to operate hotels and similar activities.

It is difficult, and indeed it is rare, for the Government to sell land and other property it purchases.

It seems to me it would be far better to pay a rental for such properties, and you already have the power to commandeer properties of this nature on a rental basis rather than making direct purchase. In view of the loss in expenses, if operated, and the difficulties of disposing of such property after the war, it certainly appears to me that renting would be preferable.

We all recognize the need of subordinating every single activity to the needs of the Army and Navy at this time, but I do think that no step other than absolutely essential should be taken by the Government which will place the Government in private business after the conclusion of the war, or force liquidation on a very large scale of such properties.

I would thank you very much to give me an itemized statement of all purchases made by the War Department of hotels and buildings of similar character, giving the cost to the Government, the appraised value, and all other details.

Cordially yours,

HARRY F. BYRD.

#### NEW PARITY PRICE BASE—ARTICLE FROM THE DALLAS MORNING NEWS

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks the leading editorial, entitled "New Parity Price Base," appearing in The Dallas Morning News of December 6, 1942.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### NEW PARITY PRICE BASE

Widespread dissatisfaction over recent inadequate efforts of the Government to improve the farm situation doubtless motivated Thursday's action by the House of Representatives, directing the Department of Agriculture to set up new parity bases which will include the farmer's labor costs. Though the latter provision has the unalterable opposition of the President, the House action is logical in the light of steadily rising farm wages, accelerated by the decree a few days ago lifting the ceiling much above what farmers can afford to pay without compensating returns for what they sell. That there was not a



single dissenting vote in this effort to assure farmers a fair share in the national income is highly significant. Not even Leon Henderson's estimate, that the revised parity prices would raise the Nation's cost of living by more than \$3,000,000,000 a year, halted the House's determined surprise move.

It is now clearly seen that unless prompt relief comes to farmers the stepped-up food production program for 1943 may break down. Throughout the Corn Belt, the Cotton South, the Pacific coast, the ranch regions of the Southwest and West and the New England farming areas, press accounts of the slaughter of dairy cows, the dispersal of herds and the abandonment of farms apprise the country of dangerous dislocations within the farming industry.

Of course, the whole modern traces back to failure in the very beginning of our war effort to keep within safe bounds industrial wages and rising food and other prices. Once these establish themselves at new highs there is nothing left but to permit farm products prices to climb proportionately. The outlook for the great army of middle-class taxpayers, who are neither benefiting from wage increases paid in war industries nor the enhanced expenditure by those whose money now comes easily, is anything but bright. It is they who will be called upon to absorb the rising costs of the farmer.

#### DEFERMENT OF FARM WORKERS

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, a letter sent to the secretaries of all local granges in the United States dealing with deferment of farm workers. The letter has been sent out by Fred Brenckman, Washington representative of the National Grange. It calls attention to the instructions sent to local draft boards by General Hershey, Director of Selective Service, under date of November 30.

A reading of Mr. Brenckman's letter analyzing the effect of Local Board Release No. 368 raises the point whether the intent of Congress in providing for deferment of essential farm workers from Army draft is being made effective by the Selective Service Director. The Brenckman analysis refers to the requirement of 16 war units for deferment as an essential for an agricultural worker.

For example, a farmer who handled a 100-acre farm consisting of 25 acres of hay and legumes, 15 acres of wheat, 15 acres of corn, 10 acres of oats, 5 acres of edible beans, 5 acres of Irish potatoes; who milked 6 cows, handled 20 hogs, 12 beef cattle, 30 sheep, and 100 chickens for egg production; who also looked after 3 horses and 25 acres of pasture and woodlot—for which he would get no credit on his 16 war units—would get 19 points, or a little more than necessary.

Mr. Brenckman notes that the man who "through his own personal and direct efforts" would be responsible for producing these acreages of crops, besides taking care of the livestock and poultry enumerated, certainly would earn his agricultural deferment. I am inclined to agree with Mr. Brenckman that comparatively few farm workers can qualify under the 16-point system worked out by the Department of Agriculture and

the Selective Service System. However, General Hershey has notified local boards that the 16 points are to be used as a standard, and not as a rigid yardstick, so it may work out in the interest of increased farm production.

I believe that local draft boards should keep in mind, however, that an experienced farm hand sent into the Army cannot be replaced by an inexperienced man—perhaps later drafted by the Director of Manpower—in the expectation that farm production will be increased. I ask that the letter from Mr. Brenckman be placed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NATIONAL GRANGE,  
Washington, D. C., December 10, 1942.  
To Grange Secretaries:

Under date of November 30, 1942, Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Director of the Selective Service System, sent new instructions to all draft boards regarding the classification of essential agricultural workers, covering an amendment to the Selective Service Act sponsored by Senator TYDINGS of Maryland. This amendment which was included in the teenage draft bill and approved by the President, provides for the deferment of every registrant found by a local board to be necessary to and regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation essential to the war effort, so long as he remains so engaged and until a satisfactory replacement can be obtained. It further provides that if any registrant leaves such occupation, the local board shall reclassify him so as to make him immediately available for military service; unless he first requests and obtains from his local board a determination that it is in the best interest of the war effort for him to leave such occupation for other work.

To serve as a guide to local boards in making their determinations, the Department of Agriculture prepared two tables of farm products, showing those essential to the war effort and those considered as not essential. Manpower requirements for the production of essential farm products are measured in terms of war units. The commodities most needed for war purposes receive the heaviest weighting, while those not so essential are given a correspondingly lower rating. Any registrant who through his own personal and direct efforts is responsible for the production of 16 war units of essential farm products may properly be considered as a person "necessary to and regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor essential to the war effort." Such persons are to be placed in class II-C or III-C. Under these rules, seasonal or part-time farm workers are not entitled to deferred classification.

In issuing its instructions to the local boards, the Selective Service System said: "In considering whether a registrant who is producing farm commodities qualifies for classification in class II-C or III-C, local boards should employ the 16 units as a standard and not as a rigid yardstick." Those falling below the required standard, but who show some promise of being able to qualify, say in 6 months, may be deferred at the discretion of the board. It is not necessary that the registrant's work shall all be done on one particular farm.

As an illustration of how the plan might work on a 100-acre farm, and merely to illustrate how it would operate, the following will suffice:

#### 100-acre farm

	Conversion factor	War units
25 acres hay and legumes.....	0.07	1.75
15 acres wheat.....	.05	.75
15 acres corn.....	.20	3.00
10 acres oats.....	.07	.70
5 acres dry edible beans.....	.20	1.00
5 acres Irish potatoes.....	.50	2.50
25 acres pasture and woodlot (no war credit).		
Livestock and poultry:		
6 milk cows.....	1.00	6.00
20 hogs.....	.05	1.00
12 beef cattle.....	.08	.96
30 sheep.....	.03	.90
3 horses.....	(1)	(1)
100 chickens (egg production).....	1.30	1.30
Total.....		19.86

<sup>1</sup> No war credit.

The man who "through his own personal and direct efforts" would be responsible for producing the acreage of crops listed above, besides taking care of the livestock and poultry enumerated, would be entitled to a credit of 19.86 war units, or 3.86 more units than necessary to secure deferred classification. From this it will be seen that those who get deferred classification as essential agricultural workers will have to earn it. It has been asked whether these rules will apply to registrants between the ages of 18 and 20. The answer is "Yes." No distinction is made between registrants in these age groups and other registrants of military age.

As you may have noticed in the newspapers, the President recently issued an order transferring the Selective Service System to the War Manpower Commission, headed by Paul V. McNutt, who is given sweeping new powers over the country's labor forces. In his first press conference following the issuance of the President's order, Mr. McNutt disclosed that he planned to place increased emphasis on occupational deferment and recognized the need of providing labor for essential agricultural work.

Fraternalty yours,

FRED BRECKMAN,  
Washington Representative.

#### CODIFICATION OF TRADE-MARK LEGISLATION

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the subject of legislation on trade-marks has been before the House and Senate off and on for 3 or 4 years. On September 17, 1941, the Senate passed Senate bill 895. On June 25, 1942, the House Committee on Patents reported Senate bill 895 with numerous amendments; and the bill in amended form passed the House on September 24, 1942.

Because of the large number of House amendments—there were 420—the bill with the House amendments was referred by the Senate to the Senate Committee on Patents on October 2, 1942. A subcommittee consisting of the junior Senator from Florida, as chairman, the able senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], and the able junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] was appointed and hearings were held by the subcommittee on December 11, 1942. Subsequently, the Committee on Patents authorized the subcommittee to report to the Senate its recommendations with respect to the House amendments. Those recommendations I now should like to submit to the Senate; and Mr.

President, I move that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 895.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, my attention has been called to the bill. I hope the Senator will not insist on his motion that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill. A little while ago I stated that as to bills which are controversial in nature, such as the bill referred to by the Senator from Florida, it would not be fair at this late hour to insist on consideration, and that I would oppose their consideration, but that I would not oppose the consideration of House bills which may readily yield to treatment in the Senate.

The bill contains a number of amendments which I think have been rather hastily considered, but, more specifically, the hearings were closed, as I am informed, on the 7th of this month. Witnesses wanted to appear before the committee, but were denied the privilege because of the desire of some members of the committee—a very proper desire—to have the bill on the calendar. I understand some of the departments would like to appear and oppose some of the amendments to the bill, but have not had an opportunity to do so. I think the bill contains several hundred amendments.

Mr. PEPPER. It contains 420 amendments.

Mr. McNARY. Only 420. That is a great many more amendments than I have offered in 25 years' service in the Senate.

Mr. President, I hope the Senator will not insist on his motion. I will have to urge its deference. It will be only 3 weeks or such matter. There are people who are interested in this measure who have appealed to me as late as today and stated that they have not had an opportunity to present to the Senate committee their views on this bill. I do not believe the able Senator from Florida or any other Senator should insist upon bringing up a bill when it is violently opposed and one of his colleagues urges that the bill go over until the next session, which is only 3 weeks away.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I am entirely sensible of the sentiments expressed by the able Senator from Oregon. I wish to say that whatever I do in the matter is done purely as an agent of the committee and on behalf of the subcommittee of which I was chairman.

The difficulty, Mr. President, is that this bill is not originally before the Senate. It passed the Senate in 1941; it passed the House some considerable time ago, and came back to the Senate for concurrence or rejection or amendment to House amendments. There may have been, and I am willing to admit that there was, some unintentional delay on the part of the subcommittee, although the subcommittee was appointed only a short time ago. If this bill is not brought up and considered today, it will mean that it will be lost entirely for this Congress. The committee did not feel that it should take the responsibility of consenting that the bill be lost in spite of the fact that it has passed both Houses.

Mr. President, I will say that the bill provides that it shall not take effect until 1 year after it shall become a law. That provision in the bill had considerable influence upon the committee in suggesting that it might proceed to enactment, knowing that there would be a year after its passage and before it became effective during which those who had objections might present them to the Congress and have them considered.

So the able Senator from Oregon will, of course, recognize the distinction between attempting to bring up a bill which has not passed the House or the Senate and the situation in which the committee finds itself of not wanting to be responsible for a bill which has passed both Houses of Congress being defeated in this Congress and having to start all over again at the next session. We felt, therefore—

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President—

Mr. PEPPER. I shall yield in a moment. We felt that it was our duty to endeavor to have the amendments of the House concurred in by the Senate, with the exception of about four or five of the House amendments which we recommend be amended in accordance with the suggestions we propose to offer.

We did hear the pros and cons of this proposed legislation; we heard the several departments; the committee has had several meetings, and has given considerable consideration to the bill. In view of the fact that the able chairman of the House Patents Committee, Hon. FRITZ G. LANHAM, of Texas, who is now on the floor, believes that the House will readily concur in the Senate amendments if the amendments were sent back to the House, we did not feel that we should take the responsibility of denying the Congress the opportunity of enacting a measure which both Houses have already passed.

I now yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wanted to ask the Senator a question. Of course we face a practical situation which I think we must take into account. As I understand, it was a Senate bill which went to the House and some four-hundred-odd amendments were added by that body. It came back to the Senate with those amendments, and, instead of sending the bill to conference, the bill went back to the Committee on Patents of the Senate, and that committee amended some of the House amendments.

Mr. PEPPER. That is correct, but they are merely clarifying amendments, I will say to the able leader.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know, of course, to what extent any Member of the other body would object to concurring in Senate amendments to House amendments to a bill of this sort, but the Senator realizes that any one Member of that body can now prevent action on anything.

Mr. PEPPER. We are aware of that, I will say to the leader.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know much about its merits, especially the House amendments, but it is unfortunate that

this bill should not have been brought up and considered at a time when we were not packing our bags to go home.

Mr. PEPPER. I agree that it is a misfortune, Mr. President; I wish it had not been necessary to present the bill at this time; but, as I have said, the chairman of the House Patents Committee who sat with the subcommittee of the Senate committee which was hearing this bill, has informed us, in the last few minutes, that he feels the House would concur in the Senate amendments if the Senate would send the amendments to the House.

The able Senator from Illinois and the able Senator from Connecticut have considered this matter. I wish the Senator from Oregon might hear an expression from those Senators before adopting a final course.

Mr. McNARY. I shall be very happy to. The able Senator speaks with a depth of feeling, but I should like to have the bill go over. I want time to look into the measure. There is great opposition to it in its present form, and I do not think it is fair, at this late hour, to bring up a bill and move to make it the unfinished business when we have adopted a resolution to adjourn finally tomorrow. I suggest to the able Senator, who can dictate his course as he sees fit, that, as a matter of common courtesy, when a Senator wants time to look into a bill and has not had the time, in such circumstances a bill ordinarily goes over.

Mr. PEPPER. If it were my bill I should readily accede to the request, and if my colleagues who are members of the subcommittee think that is the course we should adopt, I shall readily and most cordially agree.

Mr. McNARY. I have been here some years, and the Senator cannot hide behind any pretext that this is not his bill. The Senator is in charge of the bill, and, in that position, has complete control of its destiny.

I may say that as a Senator I have always yielded when another Senator said he was not prepared to take up a bill. I am willing to assume such responsibility, and the Senator from Florida should do likewise.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me?

Mr. PEPPER. I gladly yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, it was my intention to make a point of order against the motion the committee intends to present. I should like, as a preliminary, to ask the Senator from Florida if the amendatory matter which is now presented and which we are asked to adopt and send back to the House goes to the text of the bill in any shape or manner or whether it pertains entirely to one or more of the 420 amendments which the House adopted?

Mr. PEPPER. Exclusively to the House amendment, and it was carefully framed by Mr. Wood, the legislative counsel of the Senate.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.



Mr. GILLETTE. I invite the Senator's attention to the proposed amendment 4, which reads as follows:

In addition to the change made by amendment numbered 420 on page 43 of the Senate bill, lines 3 and 4, strike out "and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances."

That does not refer to an amendment of the House except by implication. That is additional matter to a specific section of the bill, and would seem to me to make it subject to a point of order.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President—

Mr. PEPPER. If the able Senator from Oregon will allow me a minute, let me say that I shall accede to his request.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I may say that I am not alone in opposition to this measure. There is very great opposition to the bill. Some memoranda have been sent to me by the departments. I do not think I am called upon to speak for the departments of the present administration; I am very glad to yield to the handsome Senator from Florida in the case of objections of this kind. However, certain Government departments were notified that the bill was to be considered on the 11th of December, 3 days ago. These were the Department of Justice, the Patent Office, the Federal Trade Commission and the Federal Food and Drug Administration. All of them oppose the bill in its present form, and their reasons for doing so are assigned. I am supplementing my remarks by saying that some of the members of the present administration holding offices of great importance do not like the bill in its present form. It is for that reason, as well as my own conviction, and because several other Senators have spoken to me about the matter, that I am asking the very able and courteous Senator from Florida to let the matter go over until we can all give it further study.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, first, I desire to respond to the remarks made by the able Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE]. As I said, these amendments were carefully drawn by Mr. Wood, the legislative counsel. If the able Senator from Iowa were a little more careful, and if he had further time to check the amendment, he would find it to be an amendment to a House amendment and not an amendment to the substance of the bill as at first glance he thought.

In the second place, in justification of the committee, let me say that the chairman of the House Patents Committee, who is now on the floor, appeared before the subcommittee and stated in the presence of the representatives of the various agencies that they had had the hearings for months, even years, in the House, and the agencies in question had never appeared to oppose the bill before the committees. It was I who initiated an inquiry of the various departments when I was appointed chairman of the subcommittee. They came, they were given hearings, and their views were presented, but the subcommittee did not happen to agree to all the suggestions the gentlemen made. It tried, however, to cover the points which they made in language which the subcommittee thought was adequate to meet

the situation. So we are very sorry if we did not literally agree with all our administrative friends, but, under the circumstances, we thought that the amendment offered by the subcommittee fairly met the situation.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the able Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Did we not, as a subcommittee, submit to the various agencies, save and except the Department of Justice or the Anti-Trust Division of the Department of Justice, the substance of the amendments which were agreed upon? In other words, every other departmental agency that was before the committee, and had any serious objections to this bill, had an opportunity to state its objections after we proposed a certain catch-all amendment, so to speak, to which each and every one agreed, with the exception of the Department of Justice.

Mr. PEPPER. That was my understanding.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. As a member of the Patents Committee I regret exceedingly that we cannot go ahead with the bill. The 400 so-called amendments are merely technical or clarifying amendments, and have nothing to do with the substantive part of the bill. There are really only 5 amendments which, as I understand, are vital in any way. The amendments which the subcommittee proposed to the measure as it came from the House were accepted by everyone, including the members of the House committee who were present. In other words, here is a bill which was passed by the Senate a long time ago, and 2 years of hearings, contained in 3 volumes, have, so to speak, been available. If the departments did not make any objection to what was going on in the House, then it seems to me they were derelict in their duty. When they come here at the last moment and try to do what they could have done a long time ago, they convict themselves of negligence in the highest degree. I do not think they should prevent what seems to me to be constructive and fair legislation on the question of trade-marks.

So far as I am concerned, I should like to see the measure acted upon, and not be held up by a single objection made by the Antitrust Division.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, before I yield I wish the able Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHY] would say just a word about this matter, since he has participated in the deliberations on the bill. Then I shall conclude.

Mr. DANAHY. I will say in response to the request of the Senator from Florida—and for the benefit of any Senators who may be interested—that hearings upon the bill proceeded through long and wearying hours over many weeks in 1941. I know that the departments could have appeared had they chosen to do so. I know that Mr. McNutt's department was represented. I remember that Mr. Kelly, chief counsel of the Food and Drug Ad-

ministration was recorded, and, in fact, the hearings will show a memorandum of his views. I mention such things only to have it understood that within the last few days there has come word to some of us that certain of the departments have sought to reserve to themselves the prerogative of ascertaining, and thereafter deciding, questions which up to now have been questions for the courts, and which under this bill would be left so. The genius of their particular thinking is that they should ascertain and decide, and thereafter bind people in the trade, with reference to the marks and the labels to be used on given articles and things of that sort. We had that view before us. We had it before us not only through the representatives of the departments who seek the powers, but we had it through conflicting viewpoints presented by various witnesses upon the hearings during the weeks the bill was under consideration.

There is in essence nothing new about the bill, Mr. President. It marks in its present stage the fruition of at least 4 years of labor on the part of the chairman of the House Committee on Patents, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM]. So far as the Senate is concerned, the amendments in the bill, as the bill has come back to us from the House, are substantially technical amendments in nature, excepting in three particulars: One has to do with what might be called the assignability of a patent or a trade-mark, another has to do with the status of incontestability, and the third revolves around the question of abandonment.

Insofar as the Senate committee was concerned, we had gone into all those matters fully in the first place. We accepted the view of the House insofar as the House had modified the original Senate language. But we all at times, Mr. President, had this one saving thought, which should not be forgotten in the light of the question that some of the departments seem now to raise. The effective date of this bill is not the date it is approved. It will be 1 year thereafter. If the bill is not passed at this session, everyone here should and will recognize that it lapses, and all the work that has been done on it has actually gone for nothing, except insofar as it has contributed to our general education, and, of course, we need that. It can be revived in the next session, it is true, and again we can have hearings, and again we can get as far as we have gotten now.

Mr. President, having delivered myself of the views which, it seems to me may, on their face, be in contravention of those held by my own distinguished leader, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], let me say that any request he makes is a command to me. Whenever the question of senatorial courtesy is involved or, shall I call it, the comity between members of the committee and the leader, who is bound to represent the views of those of his colleagues who are absent, there is only one thing for us to do. It certainly was the fact that many Senators had represented to them that no controversial matters would come up. If, in fact, this is a controversial mat-

ter—and Senators have so represented to our leader—he is duty bound to present their views. No one can question that.

Let me say furthermore that so far as I am personally concerned, I feel that the rights of all parties were and can be protected. I have made this explanation of my own position on the matter at the request of the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER].

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, may I add a word, because of the statement made by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut? I appreciate his consideration and his courtesy. He is always very polite. It has been understood between some of us that we were going to try to adjourn during the week. I had passed the word about that no controversial bills would come up. The same thing was done by the majority leader. Yesterday two Senators asked me to protect them against consideration of this bill. In fact, I did not know that it was proposed to have the bill considered. I promised I would protect the Senators. I was told enough about the bill to make me think that I should give some personal consideration to it. I was also advised today that certain Government departments wanted further time. In fairness to all I ask that the bill go over for 3 weeks, and the first of the year I shall put no obstacle in the way of immediate and early consideration of the bill.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, there is not the slightest desire on the part of any member of the committee to act antagonistically to the wishes expressed by the able Senator from Oregon, and I certainly concur in his suggestion that the matter be deferred.

#### BILLS REPORTED FROM THE COMMITTEE ON TERRITORIES AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, I report favorably House bill 7514, to authorize payment by the departments and agencies of the United States, notwithstanding section 89 of the act of April 30, 1900 (31 Stat. 141), for the use, during a limited period, of certain wharves of the Territory of Hawaii.

From the same committee I also report favorably House bill 7380, to authorize increases in wages for certain employees of the Alaska Railroad for services rendered from September 1, 1941, to December 31, 1941, inclusive, and submit a report (No. 1850) thereon.

I also report favorably House bill 5262, to provide for conveyance of lands to the town of Cordova, Alaska, and submit a report (No. 1849) thereon.

Mr. President, I send to the desk copies of the three bills, which are local in character, and after I have made a brief explanation of the bills I shall ask for their immediate consideration. One bill has to do with the use for a temporary period of time of some wharves in Honolulu. The second has to do with the cession of a piece of land in the town of Cordova, Alaska. The third has to do with the payment of increases in wages for certain employees of the Alaska Railroad in ac-

cordance with an agreement which the railroad employees made with the Government.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, my attention was distracted for a moment. I wish the Senator would restate the nature of the bills.

Mr. TYDINGS. I will restate what I said very briefly. Three House bills were referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs. They have been favorably reported to the Senate from that committee. One of them has to do with the use of some wharves in Honolulu, occasioned by the military necessities there. That use is of a temporary nature. Another has to do with the cession to the town of Cordova, in Alaska, of a piece of land which the Government owns, for use as a public park. The third has to do with increased pay for some employees on the Alaska Railroad, which is in accordance with an agreement made between the employees of the railroad and the Government. They are House bills. They have passed the House unanimously and are now favorably reported from the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs. The delegates from the Territories involved are anxious that these matters be legislated upon at this session of Congress. Let me say that if the measures are taken up I shall be glad to give further explanation of each or any one of the bills should any Senator desire.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the only question I have is that some time ago I conferred with the majority leader with reference to bills which have recently been reported to the Senate, and are now on the calendar. I was advised by him that he was going to have a call of the calendar. I was advised that since those bills were on the calendar, although reported only Friday of last week, they would come up for consideration. Do not the bills to which the Senator from Maryland refers come in the same category?

Mr. TYDINGS. I will say that about one-half hour ago I went to the majority leader and explained the bills to him, and told him what my plan was, and he said he had no objection to it.

Mr. McCARRAN. I certainly have no objection.

#### INCREASE OF WAGES FOR CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF THE ALASKA RAILROAD

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The title of the first bill will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 7380) to authorize increases in wages for certain employees of The Alaska Railroad for services rendered from September 1, 1941, to December 31, 1941, inclusive.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### CONVEYANCE OF LANDS TO CORDOVA, ALASKA

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The title of the second bill will be read for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 5262) to provide for conveyance of lands to the town of Cordova, Alaska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### USE OF CERTAIN WHARVES BELONGING TO THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The title of the third bill will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 7514) to authorize payment by the departments and agencies of the United States, notwithstanding section 89 of the act of April 30, 1900 (31 Stat. 141), for the use, during a limited period, of certain wharves of the Territory of Hawaii.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### AMENDMENT OF THE SABOTAGE ACT

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, House bill 7141, to amend the act of April 20, 1918, as amended, entitled "An act to punish the willful injury or destruction of war material, or of war premises or utilities used in connection with war material, and for other purposes," is now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary. I move that that committee be discharged from further consideration of the bill and that it be immediately considered. I wish to say that I have conferred with the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHY] about the bill, and he has consented to its immediate consideration. I have also conferred with the minority leader, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], who has no objection. The purpose of the bill is to add three words to the present sabotage law. The report of the House committee shows that the purpose of the bill is to include within the definition of "war material," as used in the sabotage law, forest products and standing timber suitable therefor. Forage has also been included within the definition.

Mr. BARKLEY. What calendar number is the bill?

Mr. MURDOCK. It is not on the calendar. I was contacted yesterday by the Grazing Service, and they think it is very important, for the protection of our forests, that these three words be added to the law. I can see no objection whatever to consideration of the bill, and I hope none will be raised.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is there any amendment offered to the bill, or is it proposed to pass the House bill as it came to the Senate?

Mr. MURDOCK. The purpose is to pass the House bill as it came to the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. I shall not object, but I do not want this action to be regarded as a precedent, that a House bill can come over to the Senate and go to a committee and not even be acted on by the



committee, and then by unanimous consent be passed by the Senate, without a report having been made from the committee.

Mr. MURDOCK. I admit that the procedure is somewhat irregular, but if the bill is to be passed at this session this is the only opportunity we will have.

Mr. BARKLEY. I shall not object, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of the bill, and that the bill be immediately considered.

The motion was agreed to, and the bill (H. R. 7141) to amend the act of April 20, 1918, as amended, entitled "An act to punish the willful injury or destruction of war material, or of war premises or utilities used in connection with war material, and for other purposes", was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### ASSIGNMENT OF CIRCUIT JUDGES TO TEMPORARY DUTY IN CIRCUITS OTHER THAN THEIR OWN—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. DANAHER submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2655) entitled "An act to amend the Judicial Code to authorize the Chief Justice of the United States to assign circuit judges to temporary duty in circuits other than their own," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its amendment.

JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,  
JOHN A. DANAHER,  
TOM CONNALLY,

*Managers on the part of the Senate.*

HATTON W. SUMNERS,  
FRANCIS E. WALTER,  
U. S. GUYER,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

The report was agreed to.

#### THE CALENDAR

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of bills on the calendar to which there is no objection, beginning with Calendar No. 1884, at which point we ended consideration of bills at the last call of the calendar. There are only six such bills on the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will proceed to state the measures on the calendar.

#### BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 7695) to aid in preventing inflation, to stabilize the rents of real property, and for other purposes, was announced as first in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the bill be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

#### EXCHANGE OF LANDS IN OLYMPIC NATIONAL PARK, WASH.

The bill (H. R. 7191) to authorize the exchange of lands not in Federal ownership within the Olympic National Park, Wash., for national forest lands in the State of Washington was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### TRANSFER OF JURISDICTION OF A PORTION OF COLONIAL NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK, YORKTOWN, VA.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5861) to authorize the transfer of jurisdiction of a portion of the Colonial National Historical Park, Yorktown, Va., from the Department of the Interior to the Department of the Navy, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys with an amendment in section 2, on page 1, line 9, after "Sec. 2," to strike out—

In the event the Secretary of the Navy shall find that the property has become surplus to the needs of that Department, he is authorized to retransfer jurisdiction and control over the same to the Secretary of the Interior, in which event it shall again become a part of the Colonial National Historical Park.

And insert in lieu thereof the following:

The President of the United States is authorized by Executive order to retransfer jurisdiction over the property to the Secretary of the Interior upon his application when, in the judgment of the President, the property has become surplus to the needs of the Department of the Navy, in which event it again shall become a part of the Colonial National Historical Park.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

#### ADMINISTRATION OF GRAZING DISTRICTS

The bill (S. 2915) relating to the administration of grazing districts was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a bill coming over from the House of Representatives which deals with the same subject matter.

The bill (H. R. 7841) relating to the administration of grazing districts was read the first time by its title, and the second time at length, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Interior may require field employees of the Grazing Service to furnish horses and miscellaneous equipment necessary for the performance of their official work and may provide at Government expense forage, care, and housing for such animals and equipment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the House bill just laid before the Senate will be substituted for Senate bill 2915. Is there objection to the present consideration of House bill 7841?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 2915 will be indefinitely postponed.

#### ACQUISITION OF LANDS FOR THE GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6671) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire lands or interest in lands for the Geological Survey, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys with an amendment, on page 1, after line 2, to strike out:

That the Secretary of the Interior may, on behalf of the United States and for the use by the Geological Survey in gaging streams, acquire such lands as may be necessary for such purpose by purchase or donation. For the same purpose the Secretary may obtain easements, licenses, rights-of-way, and leases limited to run for such a period of time or terms of years as may be required for the effective performance of the function of gaging streams.

And insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior may, on behalf of the United States and for use by the Geological Survey in gaging streams, acquire lands by purchase, condemnation, or donation, but not in excess of 10 acres for any one stream-gaging station. For the same purpose the Secretary may obtain easements, licenses, rights-of-way, and leases limited to run for such a period of time or term of years as may be required for the effective performance of the function of gaging streams: *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall be construed as affecting or intended to affect or to in any way interfere with the laws of any State or Territory relating to the control, appropriation, use, or distribution of water used in irrigation, or any vested right acquired thereunder, and the Secretary of the Interior, in carrying out the provisions of this act, shall proceed in conformity with such laws, and nothing in this act shall in any way affect any right of any State or of the Federal Government or of any landowner, appropriator, or user of water in, to, or from any interstate stream or the waters thereof.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, may I ask the able Senator in charge of the bill to direct his attention to page 2, in lines 8 to 12, inclusive? After the Department of the Interior is given the power to acquire lands by condemnation, purchase, or donation, there is the following proviso:

*Provided*, That nothing in this act shall be construed as affecting or intended to affect or to in any way interfere with the laws of any State or Territory relating to the control, appropriation, use, or distribution of water used in irrigation, or any vested right acquired thereunder—

It is nowhere stated in the proviso that nothing in the act shall be construed as affecting the rights of States in waterways other than for purposes of irrigation.

I take it, however, from the announced purpose of the bill that no powers over waterways are sought under the bill, other than for use by the Geological Survey in the gaging of streams. May I ask the able Senator from Nevada if I am correct in my assumption?

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator is correct; and I should like to go a little fur-

ther. It was made clear to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys that there was no desire on the part of the Interior Department to acquire more than a right to use the land for the purpose of setting up structures for the gaging of streams. With that in mind, the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys amended the bill so that no right, either for irrigation or for any other purpose, could inure to the Interior Department of the Federal Government pursuant to acquisition of the right to use of the land merely for its work in gaging streams.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

JOHN SWEENEY

The bill (S. 2881) for the relief of John Sweeney was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a bill coming over from the House of Representatives which deals with the same subject matter.

The bill (H. R. 7828) for the relief of John Sweeney was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That for the purposes of all laws of the United States and all regulations thereunder, John Sweeney, of Paris, Tenn., shall be deemed to be, and to have been since his birth, a citizen of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill just laid before the Senate will be substituted for Senate bill 2881. Is there objection to the present consideration of House bill 7828?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 2881 will be indefinitely postponed.

That completes the calendar.

#### THE CITADEL—SOUTH CAROLINA MILITARY ACADEMY

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, on December 20, 1842, 100 years ago next Sunday, Gov. James H. Hammond, of South Carolina, signed an act of the general assembly creating the South Carolina Military Academy—The Citadel.

I believe it is particularly appropriate to address the Senate of the United States and speak on this great military college, not only because of its hundredth anniversary, but because today, with the world engulfed in a total war, graduates of The Citadel are to be found on every battle front where the Stars and Stripes proudly wave.

The genesis of this institution is of particular significance at this time, when our country is fighting for its very existence against external enemies and enemies within our gates.

In the early 1800's the State of South Carolina had two depositories of arms

and munitions, one in Charleston and one in Columbia, with companies of State troops guarding them. The duties of the soldiers were simple, but the expense of maintaining them was relatively high; so the farseeing Governor, John Peter Richardson, conceived the plan of replacing the soldiers with worthy young men, who, while guarding the arsenals and supplies, might receive an education otherwise beyond their reach. He developed his plan, which was presented to the legislature and accepted by them after some dispute.

On March 20, 1843, the two schools opened their doors to cadets. The Charleston unit, known as The Citadel Academy, received 20 young men on the opening day. The Arsenal Academy in Columbia received 16. Nearly all were State beneficiaries who, by doing responsible duty every day, learned their obligations and afterward how to perform them.

In the weeks following March 20, more cadets entered these new and unique institutions of learning. The Arsenal Academy in Columbia, at first coequal with The Citadel Academy in Charleston, shortly was made its fourth class. After a few years all the fourth classmen were trained at the Arsenal, and only the three upper classes were accommodated at The Citadel Academy, until necessity in the War between the States made it imperative to conduct first-year instruction at both schools.

On November 20, 1846, the first graduation took place.

Upon the secession of South Carolina on December 20, 1860, Governor Pickens ordered troops to Morris Island to bar the entry of ships into the harbor. Because of their superb training as artillerymen, a detachment of Citadel cadets was taken from the college and ordered to the fortifications to man a battery of four 24-pound cannon. When, on the morning of January 9, 1861, the United States supply ship *Star of the West* attempted to enter the harbor with reinforcements and supplies for Fort Sumter, the ship was fired upon by the cadet battery and driven off.

In the years that followed, Citadel cadets, as detachments, or as a company under their own officers, or with Arsenal cadets, forming the Battalion of State Cadets, participated as State troops in eight operations, as follows: *Star of the West*, January 9, 1861; Wappoo Cut, November 1861; James Island, June 1862; Charleston and vicinity, July to October 1863; James Island, June 1864; Tulifinny, December 1864; James Island, December 1864 to February 1865; Williamston, May 1865.

Thus, cadets of the South Carolina military institutions, as organized bodies, fired the first shot of the war and the last shot east of the Mississippi River. Seven cadets gave their lives, and many were wounded in those operations. Their gallant achievements will be commemorated on Thursday, December 18, 1942, by Gov. R. M. Jefferies, who at a regimental review will affix eight battle streamers to the regimental colors.

Both academies closed as a result of the war, Federal troops occupying The Citadel buildings almost up to the time of their relinquishment by the Federal Government in February 1882.

Of 240 graduates, through 1864, nearly 200 were officers in the Confederate armed forces, in grades from second lieutenant to major general. Of this number 43 gave their lives on the battlefields.

An intrepid group of 36 cadets left The Citadel after the second tour of field service in defense of Charleston, and formed a cavalry unit known as The Cadet Company, which was attached to the Sixth South Carolina Cavalry. This group rendered service marked by conspicuous gallantry throughout the war.

The record of the cadet corps of The Citadel and alumni, both graduates and nongraduates, in the War between the States, evidenced the fact that those men learned that, in the words of Robert E. Lee, "Duty is the sublimest word in the English language."

During the War between the States and the trying Reconstruction period which followed, The Citadel was closed of course. However, it again reopened under the able leadership of Col. John Thomas, the first honor graduate of the class of 1851. He brought back to the institution its ideals and achievements of the early nineteenth century.

Citadel graduates took full part in the Spanish-American War, the Philippine Insurrection, and in the Mexican border troubles. In World War No. 1, 316 of the 777 living graduates—and probably as large a percentage of nongraduates—since the War between the States took active part, in grades from colonel to private.

In the present conflict, of 2,660 living graduates, more than 1,500 are serving as officers, as are an estimated 2,200 ex-cadets. Four Citadel men, South Carolinians, occupy key positions in the war today—Brig. Gens. Harry K. Pickett, of Ridgeway, at Pearl Harbor commands the marines of the fourteenth district; James A. Lester, of Newberry, has a Field Artillery brigade in the Pacific area; Barnwell R. Legge, of Charleston, is military attaché in Berne, Switzerland; and John T. Kennedy, of Orangeburg, commands Fort Bragg, where men are being trained by the thousands for active service. Numerous Citadel men are in the Solomons; the chief of staff of the First Marine Division, on Guadalcanal, Col. W. C. James, of Summerton, is a 1916 graduate. Many others too numerous to mention have distinguished themselves on the battlefields in the present conflict.

The aim and object of The Citadel is to produce citizens of the finest type, citizens prepared, trained, and equipped to assume the responsibilities of citizenship as well as to enjoy its benefits; and its record in this and in every other national emergency since 1843 reveals its outstanding value to the State and the Nation. It is not organized for the prime purpose of training officers for the permanent armed forces—though many have made splendid records as such—but,



first of all, to make citizens ready to lead equally well in the pursuits of peace and of war. Two recent chiefs of branches in the Army were Citadel men—Maj. Gens. James B. Allison, Chief Signal Officer, and Edward Croft, Chief of Infantry. In the ministry, in engineering, in the law, in agriculture, in education, in medicine, in the business world, Citadel men have achieved distinction. Many of the leaders in civilian pursuits are included in the thousands who have responded to the call of their country and now are leaders in the armed forces.

Since 1931 The Citadel has undergone a remarkable transformation and development under the leadership of Gen. Charles Pelot Summerall. Following his retirement as Chief of Staff in November 1930, and his reaching the statutory age March 4, 1931, General Summerall, like the immortal Robert E. Lee, turned from active military service to the even greater task of educating young men. Under his able leadership, with his thorough knowledge of military matters, as well as his great administrative ability, The Citadel has expanded, and today is unexcelled by any military institution. The cadet corps this year numbered 1,967, reporting from 45 of the 48 States and from Mexico, Puerto Rico, and Cuba.

The faculty of 102 highly trained educators are teaching these young men in one or more of 11 fields of study.

The following code of the corps of cadets may well be commended to the youth of our land:

To revere God, love my country, and be loyal to The Citadel.

To be truthful, honest, and sincere in every act and purpose and to know that honorable failure is better than success by unfairness or cheating.

To perform every duty with fidelity and conscientiousness and to make duty my watchword.

To obey all orders and regulations of The Citadel and of proper authority.

To refrain from intoxicants, narcotics, licentiousness, profanity, vulgarity, disorder, and anything that might subject me to reproach or censure within and without the college.

To be diligent in my academic studies and in my military training.

To maintain my self-respect and self-control and to respect others.

To do nothing inconsistent with my status as a cadet and gentleman.

To take pride in my uniform and in the noble traditions of the college and never do anything that would bring discredit upon them.

To be courteous and gentlemanly in my deportment, bearing, and speech, and to exhibit good manners on all occasions.

To cultivate dignity, poise, affability, and a quiet, firm demeanor.

To make friends with refined, cultivated, and intellectual people.

To improve my mind by reading and participation in intellectual and cultural activities.

To keep my body healthy and strong by physical exercises and participation in many sports.

To be generous and helpful to others and to endeavor to restrain them from wrongdoing.

To face difficulties with courage and fortitude and not to complain or be discouraged.

To be worthy of the sacrifices of my parents, the generosity of the state, and the efforts of all who teach and all who admin-

ister the college in order that I might receive an education and to recognize my obligation to them.

To make the college better by reason of my being a cadet.

To resolve to carry its standards into my future career and to place right above gain and a reputation for integrity above power.

To remember always that the honor of being a "Citadel man" imposes upon me a corresponding obligation to live up to this code.

Mr. President, I conclude by stating that it is my hope that this distinguished South Carolina institution, located in my native city, will continue with even greater strength to develop young American manhood as it should be trained.

#### ERECTION OF MEMORIAL TO TWENTY-NINTH DIVISION, AMERICAN EXPEDITIONARY FORCES

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Library, I report favorably Senate bill 233, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration. The bill authorizes the erection of a monument in the District of Columbia. It carries no appropriation at all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be reported by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 233) to provide for the erection of a suitable memorial to the Twenty-ninth Division, American Expeditionary Forces.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to grant permission to the Twenty-ninth Division Association, American Expeditionary Forces, for the erection on public grounds of the United States in the District of Columbia, other than those of the Capitol, the Library of Congress, and the White House, of a suitable memorial in honor of the dead of the Twenty-ninth Division: *Provided,* That the site chosen and the design of the memorial shall have the approval of the National Commission of Fine Arts and that the United States shall be put to no expense in or by the erection of the said memorial: *Provided further,* That unless within 5 years from the date of approval of this legislation funds are made available in an amount which, in the judgment of the Secretary of the Interior, is sufficient to insure the completion of the memorial, including the preparation of the site and the erection of the pedestal, and the erection of the memorial is begun, the authorization hereby granted is revoked.

#### DATE OF MEETING OF FIRST SESSION OF SEVENTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask that House Joint Resolution 368 be laid before the Senate and presently considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 368) fixing the date of meeting of the first session of the Seventy-eighth Congress, which was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

*Resolved, etc.,* That the joint resolution entitled "Joint Resolution fixing the dates of

meeting of the second session of the Seventy-seventh Congress and of the first session of the Seventy-eighth Congress", approved January 2, 1942, is amended by striking out "Monday, January 4, 1943" and inserting in lieu thereof "Wednesday, January 6, 1943."

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the joint resolution would merely change the date from the 4th of January, which is Monday, to the 6th of January, which is Wednesday. I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### NATIONAL POLICIES IN WAR AND PEACE

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I beg your indulgence and that of my distinguished colleagues in order that I may make a few remarks on some of the matters of national importance which have been occupying my mind during my brief but thoroughly interesting and enjoyable period of service here with you. Were it not for the fact that I am serving only for what is known as the short term, plus the fact that it seems probable this Congress will soon stand adjourned, I would long postpone these remarks out of deference to both custom and my own inclinations. Under the circumstances, I sincerely trust that they may not seem untimely.

One can do but little at best during the limited period afforded by the short term. However, I desire to add my voice to those of others on a few of the trends of our Federal Government in this crucial time. What I have to say has not been formulated simply in the time since I had the privilege of taking the oath of office here on November 18. It is based upon a deep interest in, and constant study of, government all during my adult life. It is grounded in the viewpoint not only of a United States Senator, but of an interested citizen, long a student of and participant in governmental affairs and administration, who is now privileged to address you as a colleague.

Mr. President, I am from a great agricultural State. I was born and reared in a farming community, and my hands have blistered from gripping the handles of a plow; my arms have shocked bundles of yellow grain; my fingers have drawn the milk from a placid cow. Thus I trust the Senate will understand if I speak with considerable feeling about the present farm picture.

I cannot escape the conclusion that production and not price must be the keystone of our thinking in regard to agriculture. Butter, milk, meat, and grain are every bit as essential to our boys on the fighting fronts as bullets, guns, planes, ships, and tanks. It is essential that we supply our allies with such foods as they cannot raise themselves or procure from other sources, and such as they cannot do without. It is vital that we continue to supply essential food to civilians, though there is not one of us unwilling to sacrifice here on the home front rather than have our fighting men deprived of the food they need.

The exigencies of war have multiplied demands for most essential foods, and our farmers are being called upon to strain production to the limit. I believe our food supply situation is serious, and will be threatening to the danger point in 1943 unless certain changes are made in present policies.

In order, then, to assure sufficient agricultural products for the war fronts and the home front, we must base our program on production, not price. The farmer is handicapped by a manpower problem which we hope is at last on its way to solution through recent directives. He is handicapped by shortages of equipment. With all his handicaps, and with industry offering the attraction of higher wages to both his farm helpers and himself, we must not impose upon the already strained production picture a farm-price program based only on factors of price control.

Higher prices are needed to stimulate farm production and to keep both farmers and farm laborers on the farms. Opponents of that proposal would have you believe that to allow higher farm prices would unduly penalize the civilian population. I am certain that the rest of us will gladly pay more for our food and be assured of getting food, than not to have it at all. That is from a purely selfish standpoint. But I think also that from an altruistic point of view the great majority of people realize that the farmer has worked longer hours for less money than any single large segment of our population.

As an example of some of the horrible confusion emanating from Washington today, let it be noted that Manpower Administrator McNutt recently said that farmers would have to compete with industry for labor supply. Other voices in Government say that farm-labor costs shall not be included in the ceiling price on farm products. Still others say that the price of farm products shall not advance. Yet, with industrial wages many times higher than the wage which the farmer is now able to pay, with a ceiling on the prices of farm products, by just what legerdemain can the farmer compete with industry in enticing labor into the fields? Perhaps some of our starry-eyed theorists in swivel chairs have been deluded by a belief that the lure of fresh air and the scent of new-mown hay will suffice to attract men to the plow and the pitchfork, despite the promise of a better stuffed pocketbook at the factory. Someone needs to bring order out of this chaos.

Some of the opponents of higher farm prices admit that the farmer has not had a fair deal in the past, but say that in the best interests of the Nation he must wait a while longer for what he has coming to him simply because if we allow his prices to rise we will have disastrous inflation. They say control of all prices is necessary to prevent an overall inflation, and that while the farmer was caught with relatively low prices in relation to the cost of things he must buy, that is his tough luck and he must accept the situation in the interests of the Nation.

That argument might appeal to me if I believed the results these men predict would really occur. But there cannot be a real inflation in the United States. The foundation for a real inflation does not exist in this country. Germany, some years ago, experienced real inflation, disastrous inflation, the kind of inflation these men fear. But there the basis for inflation did exist. First, there was a flight of capital and intrinsic valuables from the country. Obviously that cannot happen here under present-day conditions. Capital has nowhere to go. Second, there was a stepping up of currency issued without proper backing—the creation of printing-press money.

Wealth is not leaving this country. I repeat there is no place for it to go. The only wealth we are losing is such of our natural resources as are or will be irretrievably gone through destruction in the war itself.

No war in history has been fought without rising prices, particularly on products of the land, except under a controlled economy such as exists in Germany today.

Rising prices on farm products are definitely necessary, if we are ultimately to retire our national debt and to allow our citizens to pay the tremendous tax load.

I do not advocate that all price control be scrapped. Certain prices can certainly get out of line without proper control. In that connection, we must bear in mind the disastrous results which occurred during and after the last war, when certain farm prices rose to the point where unwarranted speculation in farm lands, with highly inflated prices for farm acreage, was encouraged. But I definitely feel that an over-all control on the prices of farm products is inadvisable and may be disastrous. Where there are shortages only increased prices can encourage and accomplish maximum production. Our farmers will patriotically produce to the fullest extent of their land, time, and ability; but they must be compensated for that production to cover their costs and a profit commensurate with that received by industry and industrial labor.

Increased farm prices will be reflected in additional earnings first to the farmer. His additional earnings will accrue in turn to the benefit of the small townspeople and through them on to the cities where their needs are initially supplied. The added food cost to the ultimate consumer will be insignificant compared to the benefits to the country as a whole.

Mr. President, I am none the less concerned about the future of small business in this country. Small business constitutes a very substantial section of our national backbone. It is being strained to a danger point today. The trend of our war-production program, through the necessarily curtailed production of civilian goods requiring strategic materials and through concentrated production of the materials of war in the hands of a relatively few large manufacturers, is toward freezing out small business, whether manufacturing,

wholesaling, or retailing, and toward consolidating and expanding the strangle hold of huge enterprise.

Some of this cannot be avoided, but what I greatly fear is that the effects on small business are not being confined to the period of the war but will be felt for all time to come. I do not believe that sufficient effort has been expended thus far by Government to protect small business. I urge with all the emphasis at my command that the Congress and the administrative agencies of the Federal Government pay prompt attention to this problem and do all in their power to guarantee the security and continuation of small business enterprises throughout the country during and following the war.

Mr. President, we need more capitalists in this country today. By "capitalists" I do not mean men with huge fortunes, controlling gigantic companies. By "capitalists" I mean particularly the small machine shop, the country flour mill, the little shoe factory, the independent canning plant, and all the other small enterprises spread over both hamlet and metropolis throughout our broad land.

Such capitalists constitute the very bedrock of our national security and soundness. Some efforts to aid small business have been made by Government, and the problem is even now receiving the careful attention of congressional committees, but more action in spreading war-production work to small business is imperative. Furthermore, in connection with tax legislation greater consideration must be given to allowing the accumulation of sufficient reserves by all corporate enterprises so that after the war they may finance themselves over whatever slack period we may encounter, and over the period of reconversion to civilian production.

To "soak" these corporations, under the guise of wartime financial requirements of the Government, beyond the point of their own security, is shortsightedness. It amounts to killing the goose that lays the golden eggs. If this trend is allowed to continue, it will result eventually in less revenue for the Government itself, disaster for the companies affected, and for all the millions of owners of equities in them, and for their employees. It will adversely affect the economy of the entire Nation.

We cannot maintain normalcy in war. Much sacrifice is necessary—much readjustment because of war needs and war shortages. Corporations, as well as individuals, can be expected to bear a larger proportionate share of the financial burden. But I do not think our efforts to maintain small business have been effective up to the present time, and I want to add my voice to that of many others who have called attention to the need for allowing sufficient corporate financial reserves to tide them over in the conversion and possible depression period following this war.

Mr. President, the manner in which it has been sought to place a maximum limitation on salaries and wages should be alarming to every American, regardless of his particular earnings, who believes



in individual initiative and the continuation of the free-enterprise system.

We are all agreed, I am sure, that abnormal profit must not be allowed to accrue to anyone as a result of this war. We believe in equality of sacrifice as nearly as that can be accomplished. We believe in contribution to the tremendous burden of the war effort in conformity with the principle of ability to pay.

None of us believes that tremendous incomes should be permitted in wartime. Beyond what is a fair and just proportion to compensate for services, to maintain past commitments and obligations, and to provide for necessary expenses, incomes should be devoted during the war to the war effort.

We have excellent machinery for the limitation of incomes. That machinery is taxation. With varying degrees of success, through the years, we have attempted to apply taxation in accordance with ability to pay. On all incomes—and especially higher incomes—we can now apply it much tighter. We are doing so.

But not long ago the President, by Executive order, later supplemented by directives of the Board of Economic Stabilization, sought to place a top limit of \$25,000 on earned income without regard to taxation. That, Mr. President, violates a principle which we in America have always held dear.

Aside from the principle involved, I think the amount of the limitation itself is set without regard to fairness or realities. There is no limitation upon unearned income, and, whereas, the coupon clipper can, after deducting his regular tax, wallow in all the money his investments will bring to his easy chair in the club, the man who is devoting his brains and his energy to producing something of value has a fixed income ceiling beyond which no height of genius or dint of superhuman effort and hard work will take him. The limitation level disregards fixed costs of maintenance with which so many are saddled, and hence in instances becomes confiscatory, no doubt to the delight of some of those who encouraged its adoption, although it is in conflict with our entire concept of government. The limitation tends to discourage competent management in places where real ability and responsibility are most needed; it will result in real "absenteeism" in some of the toughest jobs in the Nation. Many executives could not afford to have a thrombosis on \$25,000 a year! And plenty of them will have one at the speed they are going in promoting the war effort.

Mr. President, it is my hope that we can maintain for our boys who are out fighting for us—and I have boys in the service—somewhat the same kind of opportunity in the future as you and I have had in the past.

For some years our income-tax structure has been revamped largely on the theory that producers of wealth must be penalized. If the trend of our present policy continues, young men and women with initiative and ability and the will to work hard for what they get never again will have an opportunity to build a sound competence for their future or the oppor-

tunity to become a Henry Ford, a William S. Knudsen, an industrial leader in America. If the present tax trend continues, the only way a young man or woman can acquire a competence in the future is to inherit it or to marry it.

In this country we tax our corporations directly as entities, without regard for the simple fact that the income of a corporation is often the income of thousands of persons, many of them very small investors. In England I believe a sounder basis is used. There the tax on the corporation is used only as a vehicle to reach the individual interests of owners of the corporation. Not only the holders of common stock but also the holders of preferred stock and of bonds as well are reached.

"Risk capital"—capital which has been invested, risked, in equity holdings—has enabled this country to become the power it is and to reach its phenomenal stage of development in so comparatively few years. That kind of capital enabled the railroads of America to open up the Golden West. It enabled us to open up the mountains and bring forth their treasures. It enabled great laboratories to conduct research and produce marvelous machinery to make life better, to accomplish great strides in the fields of medicine, physics, chemistry—in all science—in progress in every direction. Today investment of that kind of capital is being penalized and discouraged, and the initiative and the almost superhuman energy which made this country great are consequently being stifled.

Let us hope that this is only a temporary trend which we will reverse when this war is over. But let us not be beguiled into thinking that every step we take under the canopy of war necessity, or supposed war necessity, will be retraced in peacetime. It is far easier to withhold now than to retrace later.

Our country needs a great deal of money to finance this war. In order to maintain our financial stability and in order not to pass on to future generations any more of the load than is definitely necessary, we need considerably more Federal income than we are now getting. There is one means we can employ to produce a substantial amount and at the same time wipe out an escape from taxation now prevalent that is neither fair nor just. We can do this now and we can continue it in peacetime. We do not need to employ it as an emergency measure, though the emergency calls our attention to it more clearly than ever.

That means is the taxation of securities of municipal and State governments, and past issues of the Federal Government, which are now exempt. The present exemption allows the owners of great wealth to obtain annually substantial incomes without paying an adequate tax to any government, State or Federal. A great proportion of large estates and holdings are invested, and have been for many years, in exactly that type of security. The common stocks of great corporations which produce income in the form of dividends do not enjoy tax exemption. Such stocks are not held, for the most part, by persons of great wealth.

They are held by the little fellow, by the estate of moderate size, by the widow who bought them with the proceeds of an insurance policy, which her thoughtful and thrifty husband left her, so that she would have enough income on which to live. But the man of wealth has most of his capital invested in tax-free Government securities. When the war comes along and everyone else contributes a proportionately larger share of income toward the Government, he is not required to pay his fair share of the cost of war or of the operations of Government.

Mr. President, no man can rise today to speak his mind on some of the important issues confronting our country without devoting particular attention to the peace which must follow this war. It is next in importance only to winning the war, which will be brought about by our forces and those of our allies though not without "blood, sweat, and tears," and plenty of them.

Many things about that peace remain to be settled. One thing that is definitely settled in the mind of every American is that that peace must not be lost, as it was so shamefully lost after the last Great War.

There are few, if any, who do not realize now that the United States was "short-changed" at Versailles. We know that we must avoid a repetition of that futile effort at peace, which through its weakness was destined to plunge the whole world into another war more terrible than any previous one.

The terms of that peace should have dealt even more stringently with our enemies from a military standpoint so as to shackle them forever so far as ability to commence another war was concerned. The terms of that peace should have carried with them an alliance of the victorious nations firm enough to make sure forever that no aggressors would rise again to threaten the security of all the world. There were those whose eyes were blinded by the horrors of that war into refusing to commit this country to any military measures to enforce international peace. They should realize now that it would have been far better to dispatch a few battleships and a comparative handful of men a few times during the past 20 years to enforce the peace terms rather than to face the present situation which involves dispatching millions of men and expending billions of dollars in materials to end this war. We were penny-wise but pound-foolish—in terms of human blood. We scrapped and sank a good share of our Navy; we refused to risk any American lives for the purpose of maintaining peace; we withdrew into our shell; we were negligently in preparedness; we thought that if we idealistically disarmed, all nations would politely follow suit; we continued to think that because we hated war and did not want war we could keep war away from us—and we found we were wrong, tragically wrong.

While the whirl of scientific progress in the development of military and naval machinery of destruction was in our ears, while amazing progress in aviation was

before our eyes, we continued to think in terms of horse-drawn cannon. We talked of the impregnable position we occupied because of the great oceans surrounding us, even while men breakfasted in London and had dinner in New York. We were thinking in terms of an age of sailing vessels, though we were in an era of motor torpedo boats and mile-a-minute destroyers.

If every American could learn the lessons of the history of the past 25 years the whole world's future would be more secure today.

We did not stop making mistakes at Versailles. We helped build the foundation for war when we failed to stop Japan when she entered Manchukuo. We helped build it stronger when we stood placidly by while our former allies failed to enforce the Versailles treaty when Germany moved into the Ruhr, when Mussolini moved into Abyssinia.

I believe in carrying this war through to a thorough conclusion, in whipping Germany, and Italy, and Japan completely and absolutely. I do not think any other end can possibly result in lasting peace. I believe that after this war those countries should be thoroughly disarmed and should be kept disarmed forever afterward.

I believe the American people will support the establishment of an international police force, with the participation of these United States, to maintain international order and to promote lasting world peace. I believe it will be far better to maintain a substantial standing Army and Navy, and to engage in minor combat, if that be necessary at times, to keep some upstart from commencing another world conflagration. The cost in American lives would be infinitesimal compared to that of still another great war. The saving of lives alone would be worth any cost in money and resources; but I believe that the maintenance of adequate armed strength will cost only a fraction, through the years, of what it costs suddenly to mobilize, train, and equip a huge army as we were required to do in this war.

I believe in international cooperation among all the United Nations, and others similarly inclined, to establish a just and lasting peace, and to maintain it. I believe in treating fairly at the peace table the common peoples of the vanquished nations, but I believe in being ruthless with their military and political leaders who have brought this war upon us. It is ridiculous to imprison drunken drivers for manslaughter and on the other hand to let international gangsters, guilty of the death of millions, and of endangering civilization itself, go into luxurious exile.

But when this country deals at the peace table I want it to deal to win not only lasting world peace, but to win for itself. We hear a great deal about international idealism of a type which I fear is floating in cloudy theory. It is an idealism which I do not think will stand the test of cold analysis and which I do not believe can ever exist unless there is a change in human nature, which has not changed basically in all history.

I favor a practical idealism in international affairs that will stand a flinty

scrutiny, and the buffeting about which it will receive in the test of practical world affairs. I favor an idealism that will protect these United States. I favor idealism for the United States at the peace table, but I do not favor our being godfather, guardian, Lady Bountiful, Santa Claus, and free bread line for all the world.

Mr. President, I sometimes fear that the type of dreamy idealism preached these days means in simple terms a huge world dole at the major expense and sacrifice of our own people. All too much of it has emanated from Washington and New York of late. If this same spirit as applied to other great countries emanated from London and Amsterdam and Paris and Stockholm and Moscow and the like, one could perhaps view it more charitably.

I do not advocate that this great country should evade its fair share of responsibility in the rehabilitation of a war-torn world, and in intelligently assisting to remove the basic causes of war so far as possible. But in so doing let us proceed on the theory of helping others to help themselves. Let us extend aid in sharing with others the benefits of our knowledge. Let us follow this basic course rather than one of the paternal check signer for the prodigal or indigent son.

I could at this point draw an analogy between some of the methods used in connection with certain domestic reform policies of the past several years and the point I am making in regard to our assistance in international affairs, but I think it is sufficiently clear without elaboration.

I believe we should think first of the United States and its interests, and fit those interests into the world pattern, rather than to think first of the world and its interests and then throw the United States into that pattern.

Mr. Churchill and his associates in the post-war world will protect the interests of Great Britain, just as Stalin in the post-war world will protect the interests of Russia, and Wilhelmina will protect the interests of the Netherlands. I am sure the people of America want our leaders to cooperate with these other nations in winning the war. I am sure our people want them to cooperate in winning the peace and in maintaining the peace. I do not believe we can live in an isolated atmosphere today. But I believe that in that cooperation we should be looking primarily after our own interests, as other nations will be looking after theirs, and that we should promote the interests of other countries only as such promotion will reflect to the ultimate good of our own people.

Let us fight to win the war, then strive to win and keep the peace.

Mr. President, it has been proposed that the Senate should approve all appointments to positions in the Federal Government for which the annual pay is \$3,000 or more. I sincerely hope that favorable action will be had on that proposal. The Senators from the respective States are well situated to become informed upon and best qualified to judge the merits of prospective ap-

pointees to important Government positions. By the adoption of such a proposal, the power of the Senate will be strengthened, and a means will be provided to assure more efficient Government personnel and to stop unwarranted personnel increases.

I do not need to emphasize that in the minds of our people the prestige of Congress as a whole has been sorely shaken at times during the past few years. Much of the criticism has been unjustified. I have deeply regretted that some of the criticism was ever made, and even more deeply regretted the manner in which some of it was publicized. My reason for that regret is that the Congress is the bulwark of our democracy, and when it loses any degree of confidence among the people, to that extent is our form of government itself endangered.

Even in an emergency the Congress must recognize a limit beyond which it cannot surrender its power and yet retain a measure of authority sufficient to safeguard our system of free enterprise, our governmental system of checks and balances, our assurances of the freedom we now fight to maintain for ourselves and for American posterity.

In urging my distinguished colleagues to be ever alert to maintain the powers that must remain in Congress, I do not intend to reflect unduly upon the present administration of our Government. While I have viewed with deep misgivings the apparent implications of some of its policies, I have hope that my misgivings may be without foundation, and I further believe it is not the time to discuss these matters now. My convictions about the powers to be retained by Congress would be as deeply ingrained under whatever administration we may ever find ourselves. They rest on principles on which our Nation was founded, not on whether a given Chief Executive may or may not be capable of wisely administering all of the powers of government.

My brief associations here among you have been exceedingly pleasant ones. I regret that they may not be longer. My experience here has enabled me to obtain a better grasp of the complexity, number, and extent of the grave problems which confront you every moment; of the ardor and length of your labor in the service of the people; and the meagerness of your reward. I shall leave with a lasting respect for the responsibilities of your position, and the sincerity with which you are all attempting to discharge them. Your kindness to me in these few weeks has been appreciated, as is your courtesy in allowing me this opportunity to unburden my mind of some of the thoughts it has dwelt upon of late.

#### REEMPLOYMENT OF PERSONS RETIRED UNDER THE ALASKA RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, from the Committee on Civil Service I report favorably House bill 7336 to permit the reemployment of persons retired under the Alaska Railroad Retirement Act. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be now considered. It was passed unanimously,



by the House. The bill allows the Alaska Railroad to reemploy personnel which has already been retired. The reason I am asking for immediate consideration of the bill is because of the manpower shortage on the Alaska Railroad.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New York?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 7336) to permit the reemployment of persons retired under the Alaska Railroad Retirement Act was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### FEES FOR SERVICES PERFORMED OR PUBLICATIONS FURNISHED BY DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

**Mr. MALONEY.** Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House bill 6729, Calendar 1882.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

**THE LEGISLATIVE CLERK.** A bill (H. R. 6729) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to establish fees or charges for services performed or publications furnished by the Department of Commerce.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### ADDITIONAL DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ALABAMA

**Mr. VAN NUYS.** Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House bill 7810. I may say that on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary I reported this bill favorably earlier today. Owing to the necessity for a new judge in the district, I ask for immediate consideration of the bill.

**Mr. McNARY.** Is the district in Alabama?

**Mr. VAN NUYS.** Yes; the northern district of Alabama.

**Mr. McNARY.** The able assistant majority leader, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], spoke to me of the matter during the day. I have no objection.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

**THE CHIEF CLERK.** A bill (H. R. 7810) to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the northern district of Alabama.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### REPORTS TO THE GOVERNMENT BY WHOLESALE AND RETAIL FOOD DISTRIBUTORS

**Mr. VANDENBERG.** Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter from Mr. J. H. McLaurin, president of the United States Wholesale Grocers' Association, who prophesies that—

In 1 more year, or less, 50 percent of the wholesale and retail food distributors of the United States will be out of business if they

must suffer a continuation of the Government's demand for reports, statements, inventories, and regulations, with which it has become physically impossible for them to comply.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DECEMBER 10, 1942.

**DEAR SENATOR:** In 1 more year, or less, 50 percent of the wholesale and retail food distributors of the United States will be out of business if they must suffer a continuation of the Government's demand for reports, statements, inventories, and regulations, with which it has become physically impossible for them to comply.

With some of these austere and Hitleristic warnings imposed upon them, they are facing the \$10,000 penalty threatened in some cases or, in default thereof, they will languish in prison for the duration.

Can and will the Congress of the United States take note of this intolerable situation and come to the rescue of several hundred thousand patriotic, loyal American citizens, who are today suffering and cringing under the lash?

Respectfully submitted.

U. S. WHOLESALE GROCERS' ASSOCIATION,  
J. H. McLaurin, President.

**Mr. VANDENBERG.** Mr. President, I ask that the letter be referred to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Non-essential Federal Expenditures.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, the letter will be so referred.

#### PERSONAL STATEMENT BY SENATOR MALONEY

**Mr. MALONEY.** Mr. President, I was designated by the Committee on Immigration to present to the Senate and manage in the Senate, House bill 6250, a bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940; by the Committee on Banking and Currency of the Senate to report and manage Senate bill 2560, a bill to provide for the effective utilization of existing stocks of rubber tires to aid in making rubber tires available for essential uses, and for other purposes; and also by the Committee on Banking and Currency to present to the Senate and endeavor to have passed Senate bill 2763, a bill to authorize the use for war purposes of silver held or owned by the United States.

I should like to have the RECORD show that I made every possible effort to bring those bills before the Senate for consideration.

At this late date, taking everything into consideration, it seems useless to proceed further. I have discussed with the majority leader the present situation as it applies to those bills, and I shall make no further attempt to have them passed at this session; but I shall try to present them during the next Congress.

**Mr. BARKLEY.** Mr. President, I am glad to confirm what the Senator from Connecticut has said about his efforts in behalf of the three measures he has mentioned. I am in a position to know that no one has been more earnest, diligent, or alert in seeking to obtain consideration for all the measures entrusted to his care. I think the Senator from Connecticut has done as much as anybody could have done, and as much as anybody had the right to expect him to do to bring those measures before the Senate for consideration. I am glad to confirm what he has said about his own efforts, and I am

proud to do so. He is entitled to that statement from me. I think the Senate will agree with my statement.

**Mr. MALONEY.** I thank the Senator.  
**Mr. MURDOCK.** Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

**Mr. MALONEY.** I yield.

**Mr. MURDOCK.** In response to what the able Senator from Connecticut has said, especially with reference to the silver bill, as one of the Senators opposed to that bill, let me say that he has not allowed the opposition to eat, sleep, or do anything else but be keenly on the alert at all times in our successful efforts to prevent the consideration of that bill. I believe that he has done all that any Senator could possibly do in his attempt to bring that bill before the Senate.

**Mr. BARKLEY.** Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

**Mr. MALONEY.** I yield.

**Mr. BARKLEY.** Commenting further upon what the Senator from Utah has said to the effect that the Senator from Connecticut has not permitted the opposition to eat, sleep, or do anything else, I think he will modify that statement to the extent that the Senator from Connecticut has not only permitted but compelled the opponents of the bill to make a stand in opposition to its passage.

**Mr. MURDOCK.** That is correct.

**Mr. MALONEY.** Mr. President, I am not a candidate for reelection at this time. [Laughter.] However, I should like to warn the very able Senator from Utah that he may anticipate hunger in the days ahead.

**Mr. MURDOCK.** Mr. President, in reply to that statement, let me say to the Senator from Connecticut that he will find the opponents of the silver bill in the Senate when it meets again.

#### RETURN OF THE CHRISTMAS SEASON

**Mr. RADCLIFFE.** Mr. President, no return of the Christmas season for ages has had such a special significance as is the case this year. The very definite strategic turn in the tide of war in favor of our allies and ourselves as Christmas approaches will have an extraordinary significance in history.

Christmas, more than any other festival or season of the year, has developed many quaint customs in its observances. Some are Christian in origin; some are Jewish; and many are pagan. Some are religious; others are secular. Christmas commemorates the birth of a Great Teacher who taught sublime tenets of religion and extolled, in a manner unequalled, humane doctrines of equality, fraternity, and freedom.

Nowadays we think instinctively of Christmas as a children's holiday, but it has charm and appeal for persons of all ages. Its varieties of expression have been countless. It prompts sympathy in thought and deed for the sick and poor. It encourages hospitality and good cheer and prompts geniality of mood, generous impulses, and kindly deeds. Indeed, so far-reaching were its influences years ago that sometimes even rigors of imprisonment were lessened, if not eliminated, during the Christmas festivities. The general effect of Christmas celebrations was decidedly worth

while, even though wisdom has not always been sufficiently present in all of the festivities.

Historical records and traditions, especially those of Great Britain, illustrate how widely hospitable impulses were carried out to an extent quite unworkable today. Sir Walter Scott had this hospitable practice in mind when he wrote:

A Christmas gambol oft could cheer  
The poor man's heart through half the year.

Not only was the poor man's heart cheered, but in many ways his personal surroundings and circumstances were benefited. A society rigidly, and at times even cruelly, regulated and regimented, sought and found each year for an interval at Christmas a respite, a turn of the wheel of life. That turn brought to many persons changes highly beneficial even though designed to be temporary.

Christmas customs observed years ago had not only far-reaching influences upon religious teaching, but also closely affected many institutions concerned with civil, economic, and social life. We have boasted that the world has been growing better; but are we sure that the spirit of Christmas is as helpful and constructive today as it was years ago?

The underlying principles of Christmas are basically and fundamentally opposed to the display of cruel force and inhumanity to the poor, weak, and oppressed. The Nazis cannot truthfully do otherwise than admit that what Christmas has sought to do is totally at fundamental variance with the purposes of their alleged New Order and of the deceptive and humiliating Co-Prosperity which the greedy and grasping Japanese would inflict upon the world.

One of the most striking results of the very recent Allied successes has been the permanent loss to the Axis Powers of security. Recently the Nazi has been stopped full in his tracks. He has tasted the bitterness of defeat. He has acquired as a fellow traveler and an unavoidable companion the demon of insecurity. The world now knows that the Nazi and the Japanese do not have reason for confidence that they can count upon retaining their ill-gotten gains. Every acquisition by conquest is in a state of jeopardy, actual or potential. No matter how favorably the tide might turn in favor of the Axis Powers, even though they might succeed in overrunning new territories, with them is and will remain the haunting foreboding that what they have taken, they cannot keep.

This realization and these misgivings and doubts cripple a brawling conqueror almost as much as an actual defeat itself. When Hitler stated some time ago in substance that he had built his empire so strongly that it would last for a thousand years, he was boasting that his system is flawless and all-sufficient and will remain so. In Hitler's mind not only his methods of conquest, but his handling and holding of the peoples in the countries overrun, are perfect in conception and execution and no force could prevail against him.

A dictator attempting conquest of other countries must have implicit confidence in his own methods. Also the people overrun by him must accept such an estimate. The conquering dictator must appear to be infallible. Otherwise, as soon as there is doubt that his system and methods are perfect, an insidious element of weakness enters and spreads quickly. As soon as reverses follow these doubts, the inflated position of the dictator rapidly becomes perilous.

Hitler knows that besides his men, guns, airplanes, and other implements of warfare, he needs the reputation generally that he is invincible. One of the reasons why France remained quiescent under Hitler's rule was that France believed that no one could withstand his might.

In a speech in the United States Senate last June, I stated that Hitler was beginning to be haunted by premonitions of defeat. What were then merely fitful warnings to him have become a grim reality. His legions which he boasted were irresistible have met actual defeat. More reverses are clearly in prospect. Two stark realities which Hitler faces are of the kind which wracks one's soul. One of these is the devastating realization that someone can and has challenged him successfully. The Nazis and the Japanese now know that no matter what battles they win or what countries they plunder, no matter how pretentious their ill-gotten gains, now no empire is possible to them other than one which never would be stable or fundamentally secure, but essentially transitory and evanescent.

For centuries the march toward democracy and liberty has been on the whole a steady and a successful one. Each year saw the people of the world seeking and more eagerly cherishing principles of liberty, equality, and freedom. More and more despotic government was regarded as becoming outmoded. It was believed that in a reasonably short time it would disappear from the earth. Mr. President, you and I thought that the movement toward freedom would grow stronger and stronger until the world knew despotic power only as a tale that was told.

A cataclysmic change came about. Out of the convulsions and agonies of the late war there sprang up quickly the ugly concept that power was not vigorous and efficient unless it was totalitarian, that a ruler was not a "he-man" unless he trampled upon human liberties, that a ruler was not forceful and efficient unless he were a man of blood and iron with a contemptuous disregard of democracy.

That sinister concept of government met with quick success in some parts of the world. Thereupon the totalitarianist said Jefferson was wrong, that the people best governed were, not the ones least governed, but those who in body and soul were regulated by totalitarian despots. The acid test of the doctrine of totalitarianism has been made. The results show unmistakably that a nation can thrive without the sacrifice of human liberty. Hitler thought the slave would

and could fight better than the free man. Each day proves that he is wrong, emphatically so. To be concrete: Neither Hitler nor any other despot could have planned and carried out more effectively the expedition of the armada of the United Nations to Africa and our war operations since then on that continent, including the highly important and beneficial arrangements made by us with Admiral Darian.

Modern warfare "acquaints a man with strange bedfellows." Today such associates may differ widely in tastes, ways of living, and theories of government; but those of the United Nations are closely united in efforts to prevent the world from being engulfed in the noisome messes of the Axis Powers.

Modern warfare also acquaints a man with strange bedfellows in the guise of unprecedented and vexatious regulations and restrictions. Many of them are inevitable in all-out warfare. We are ready to submit uncomplainingly to them if they are deemed to be necessary and equitably imposed. We shrink from no associations and requirements which will help us to win the war and to bring home as quickly as possible our armed forces fighting so gallantly for the cause of freedom.

Those regulations and restrictions are concerned mainly with priorities, price fixing, and the rationing of commodities such as gasoline and certain food products. There is quite general agreement that war needs and anti-inflationary efforts make such limitations necessary, although people can easily differ as to how far these regulations should go. Because of their nature, no other types of restrictions and regulations are more harassing than those, or more difficult to handle fairly. We are far from being satisfied that we have settled upon the proper range for those measures or that all of them adopted are working satisfactorily. There will be a continuing need for constructive criticism and suggestions in the handling of those problems.

Naturally it is too early to predict with assurance what political views will be dominant in government after the terrible holocaust of war is over. This much will doubtless happen: The discrediting of the use of force as applied under totalitarian governments will be so widespread that it is quite possible that the pendulum will swing much farther than ever before in the direction of democratic institutions. Democratic ideals of government will again be sought and venerated throughout the world. Principles of liberty and equality again will be widely revered.

We hope and believe that after this war the principles of democracy will be reestablished so firmly that no opposition will prevail against them. But we must be diligent in trying to avoid the mistakes of the past in the workings of democracy. Many of us were inclined to believe that the principles of democracy are basically so sound that constant vigilance is not necessary to safeguard against weaknesses frequently found in



their application. But to be really effective democracy needs to be more than good in concept. It must also be wise and constructive in operation.

What has all this to do with Christmas? More than may be readily apparent. Christmas by history and tradition symbolizes much of what we and our allies are fighting for today.

In these days it is difficult to realize how rigid and cruelly severe were the social and economic distinctions prevailing years ago. At Christmastide such distinctions were suspended or disregarded to an astonishing extent. Not infrequently during the Christmas season the pendulum swung far the other way. Often the master and servant sat down together at Christmas dinner. Sometimes even on Christmas Day the master and mistress waited on the servants at dinner. Such transitory upheavals were fanciful but suggestive. The fact that "boy kings" and "boy bishops" superseded in part, even for a short time, the prerogatives and authority of their elders in high estate had a bit of significance. Christmas customs, at times followed out quite curiously, carried a very obvious challenge to existing prerogatives of rank and privilege, as crystallized quite definitely. All such topsy-turvy arrangements must have suggested the concept that human contacts quite different from what were customary could be known and enjoyed for the moment, at least.

Those who by their actions illustrated such flexibility at Christmas suggested, although often unconsciously and unintentionally, that a broader concept of fraternity, equality, and liberty had a rightful place in existing political, social, and economic arrangements.

True it was that after the end of the Christmas season there was a return to the former social and economic status, with its accompanying harshness and rigid distinctions of class and caste. Surely, however, something of a tolerant, fraternal, humane, and kindly spirit must have survived the Christmas season to continue constructively throughout the year.

The spirit of friendliness and hospitality at Christmas, even to enemies, sometimes was carried out to a degree almost unbelievable. We all remember the story of what happened when Henry V was besieging Rouen. Food had about disappeared in that city, whose inhabitants were facing either surrender or starvation, when the season of Christmas came around. Henry V, eager as he was to capture the city at the earliest moment possible, felt that on Christmas Day everyone in the besieged city should eat a Christmas dinner. Therefore, he sent into the city food sufficient for one meal for the entire population. After the ending of that day, he pressed the siege vigorously to a successful ending.

It may be that Henry's generous impulse was far-fetched and fantastic, it may be that it was chimerical and impractical, but what a protest it was! What a very significant groping toward an ideal! Contrast the course of Henry V at Rouen with the hideous infamy of Pearl Harbor. Hitler and the Japanese have shown to the world that they regard

the friendly and humanitarian ideals which have characterized Christmas throughout the ages as signs of softness and weakness to be ignored and scorned by them in their insolent and ambition-crazed schemes to rule the world by blood and iron.

Bear in mind, however, that true observance of Christmas did not in by-gone days mean the meek acceptance of abuse of manifestations of friendly good will. The churlish souls who were out of harmony with the true spirit of Christmas were not welcome guests. Also, if they attempted to flout the friendliness of the occasion by hostile acts, they met with a tough reception. The true Christmas spirit did not countenance the use of insolent force or submission to it.

Not only the general spirit of the Christmas season but also the quaint upheavals in rank, caste, and authority illustrated the same desire for less restraining features in social, economic, and political institutions. Today that spirit animates us in our opposition to the Axis Powers. What the armies, navies, air forces, merchant marine, and civilian governments of the peoples of the United Nations are doing today to stop totalitarianism in its sinister attempt to overwhelm the world illustrates in a tremendous way the underlying spirit of the plans and celebrations of medieval Christmas.

Just how far Christmas created and kept alive a spirit of equality and freedom in the world we cannot definitely know, but certainly it was a factor. Who can say how far the Magna Carta, Petition of Rights, Bill of Rights, Declaration of Independence, our Constitution, and other historic landmarks in the struggle for freedom can trace their descent in part from the strivings of the Christmas spirit toward free institutions.

In similar manner the church throughout the so-called Dark Ages kept alive the flame of learning. Thereby it made the Revival of Learning a possibility. So also during those days the Christmas spirit, aided by some of the manifestations of the spirit of chivalry, kept alive in the hearts of men certain principles of fraternity, equality, and freedom.

Today, in the carrying on of all the activities which the grim necessities of war demand, in the sadness which the dislocations and separations in family life resulting from the war have brought to us, and in sympathetic realization of the hardships, strains, and tragedies of this war so cruelly thrust upon us, we shall do well to be mindful of the best which Christmas can teach us.

Were the Axis to win, Christmas, with its much-prized significance, religious and otherwise, would cease to exist. Its doctrines of equality, fraternity, and freedom, which we with increasing might are trying to preserve against the violent and vicious attacks of the Axis, would be lost to the world. Our basic institutions would be submerged.

It is indeed highly appropriate that the recent significant successes of the United Nations in their fight against heretofore successful adversaries should be occurring as the season of Christmas is approaching.

The gigantic struggle which we are making today for free institutions demonstrates that the spirit of Christmas did not perish from the earth. It is re-incarnated in the spirit which today leads us to resist the arrogant iconoclastic pretensions of the Axis Powers. By the time next Christmas comes, we hope, although we cannot reckon upon so soon a happening, the world again will be at peace. Then may it be that when on Christmas Day, in the morning, the bells on earth ring "Peace on Earth, Good Will to Men," their notes will be heard by a world freed forever from the hideous menace of the cruel and sinister ambitions of the Axis Powers.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bill and joint resolution of the Senate:

S. 2398. An act amending the provisions governing the issuance of patent for certain lands to the town of Fletcher, Okla.; and

S. J. Res. 170. Joint resolution extending until April 30, 1943, the period for which overtime rates of compensation may be paid under the Acts of June 28, 1940 (54 Stat. 676), October 21, 1940 (54 Stat. 1205), and June 3, 1941 (55 Stat. 241), and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 359) to amend Public Law 623, Seventy-seventh Congress, entitled "Joint resolution to codify and emphasize existing rules and customs pertaining to the display and use of the flag of the United States."

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions of the Senate:

#### Senate Concurrent Resolution 41

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring).* That the two Houses of Congress shall adjourn on Wednesday, the 16th day of December, 1942, and that when they adjourn on said day they stand adjourned sine die.

#### Senate Concurrent Resolution 42

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring).* That notwithstanding the adjournment of the second session of the Seventy-seventh Congress, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives be, and they are hereby, authorized to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses which have been examined by the Committee on Enrolled Bills of each House and found truly enrolled.

#### ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 194. An act for the relief of the Upham Telephone & Electric Co., Upham, N. Dak.;

H. R. 1646. An act for the relief of George Geis, and the administrator of the estate of Joseph Glaser, deceased;

H. R. 2894. An act for the relief of Mrs. William Butak, Dorothy Clyde, Mrs. Albert Westcott, Mrs. Albert Meyer, Florence Johnson, Marie Grill, Mrs. Leo Maloney, Marian

McDonald, Mrs. Edward Beier, Mrs. E. L. Bly, Mrs. Lucien Miller, Lois Kehni, Reka Berg, Mrs. Ollis Klieker, Wilma Vogler, and Mary Chisholm;

H. R. 2970. An act for the relief of Hiram Colwell;

H. R. 2973. An act for the relief of George O. Hanford;

H. R. 4029. An act for the relief of Catherine Barrett;

H. R. 4741. An act for the relief of the Midwest Oil Co.;

H. R. 4898. An act for the relief of Bothilda Stender;

H. R. 4918. An act for the relief of Anna J. Krogoll;

H. R. 5154. An act for the relief of the estate of Elmer White;

H. R. 5157. An act to reimburse F. E. Webster for labor and material used in the emergency construction of buildings and utilities at Civilian Conservation Corps Camp Escanaba;

H. R. 5175. An act for the relief of Edward Workman;

H. R. 5274. An act for the relief of Michael Leo Fitzpatrick;

H. R. 5409. An act for the relief of Gwendolyn Anne Olhava and Anthony L. Olhava;

H. R. 5486. An act to provide for means of egress for buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5649. An act for the relief of Alice Comas, Robert Comas, and Frances Williams;

H. R. 5812. An act for the relief of William E. Averitt;

H. R. 6095. An act for the relief of the estate of Mrs. H. L. Smith, deceased;

H. R. 6285. An act for the relief of Clarence A. Houser and his wife, Mrs. Jewel Houser;

H. R. 6366. An act for the relief of Alex Lawson;

H. R. 6370. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ching Shee (Ching Toy Wun);

H. R. 6489. An act for the relief of I. Arthur Kramer;

H. R. 6510. An act for the relief of L. H. Miller;

H. R. 6520. An act for the relief of Jane A. Thornton;

H. R. 6569. An act for the relief of William M. Miller;

H. R. 6653. An act for the relief of William R. Ivey;

H. R. 6677. An act for the relief of Ronald Leroy Chen;

H. R. 6695. An act for the relief of Mrs. Esther Mann;

H. R. 6749. An act for the relief of Mrs. Bessie Schakett;

H. R. 6771. An act for the relief of Lillian J. Delavergne and Myrla Delavergne;

H. R. 6780. An act for the relief of J. M. Jesse;

H. R. 6839. An act relating to the appointment and retirement in the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve of persons with physical disabilities, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6863. An act for the relief of Thomas W. Dowd;

H. R. 6873. An act for the relief of Maude Leach;

H. R. 6923. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ada F. Ogle;

H. R. 6924. An act for the relief of Joseph F. Gordon;

H. R. 7012. An act for the relief of Litchfield Bros., Aurora, N. C.;

H. R. 7035. An act for the relief of Mr. Garland Galley, of Baldwin, Ga., and Mrs. Clara Mae Galley, of Baldwin, Ga.;

H. R. 7167. An act for the relief of Elmore Lee Lane;

H. R. 7168. An act for the relief of Grover C. Wedgwood;

H. R. 7185. An act for the relief of Mrs. James Q. Mattox;

H. R. 7247. An act for the relief of Silas Frankel;

H. R. 7288. An act to relieve certain employees of the Veterans' Administration from financial liability for certain overpayments and allow such credit therefor as is necessary in the accounts of certain disbursing officers;

H. R. 7316. An act for the relief of Dr. J. M. Scott and Mrs. J. M. Scott;

H. R. 7333. An act for the relief of Arkansas Gazette, Hope Star, the Hope Journal, Arkansas Democrat Co.;

H. R. 7357. An act for the relief of Madeline Flori;

H. R. 7518. An act for the relief of Bernice Pyke, Arthur P. Fenton, Carl E. Moore, and Clifford W. Pollock;

H. R. 7522. An act to amend the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1943, so as to authorize the use of public-school buildings in the District of Columbia as and for day nurseries and nursery schools, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7587. An act for the relief of Etta A. Thompson, Marion E. Graham, Ruth Irene Morgan, and Alice K. Weber;

H. R. 7633. An act to increase the pay and allowances of the Army Nurse Corps, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7649. An act for the relief of Ralph B. Randall, rural rehabilitation supervisor, Farm Security Administration, Visalia, Calif.;

H. R. 7650. An act for the relief of Col. Leo A. Luttringer, United States property and disbursing officer for Pennsylvania;

H. R. 7651. An act for the relief of William F. Perkins, rural rehabilitation supervisor, Farm Security Administration, Pinal County, Ariz.;

H. R. 7652. An act for the relief of Warren M. Engstrand, grant supervisor, Farm Security Administration, Bakersfield, Calif.;

H. R. 7653. An act for the relief of Ensign Donald L. Grunsky;

H. R. 7705. An act for the relief of James E. Savage;

H. R. 7781. An act to define the real property exempt from taxation in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 7844. An act to amend sections 3, 4, 5, and 6 of the act approved March 7, 1942 (Public Law, 490, 77th Cong.), providing for continuing pay and allowances of certain missing persons;

S. J. Res. 140. Joint resolution granting permission to Hugh S. Cumming, Surgeon General (retired) of the United States Public Health Service, to accept certain decorations bestowed upon him by the Republics of Colombia, Haiti, and Chile; and

H. J. Res. 365. Joint resolution to amend the Revenue Act of 1942.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees or ordered to lie on the table.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

#### EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. VAN NUYS, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

M. Neil Andrews, of Georgia, to be United States attorney for the northern district of Georgia, vice Lawrence S. Camp, resigned.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

Dr. Joseph S. Dorton, from the State of North Carolina, to be area director, at \$4,600 per annum, in the Raleigh area office of the War Manpower Commission.

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Capt. Jack H. Duncan to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, while serving as naval attaché to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, to rank from the 7th day of December 1942;

Capt. Francis E. M. Whiting to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 16th day of May 1942; and

Col. James T. Moore to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps for temporary service from the 16th day of September 1942.

By Mr. BAILEY, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

#### THE JUDICIARY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Louis E. Goodman to be United States district judge for the northern district of California.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, when the Executive Calendar was called on two former occasions I objected to the consideration of this nomination at the instance and request of the distinguished senior Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON]. I have conferred with him. He is necessarily absent today.

I shall not ask that the nomination go over another day. I shall content myself with stating that if the distinguished senior Senator from California were present, he would vote "no" on the confirmation of the nomination, because he feels that in some respects the nominee lacks the essential qualifications for the position.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Louis E. Goodman to be United States district judge for the northern district of California?

The nomination was confirmed.

#### POSTMASTER—NOMINATION REPORTED ADVERSELY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Robert Leo Quirk to be postmaster at Washington, La., which had been reported adversely from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

The nomination was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the calendar.

#### POSTMASTERS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a large number of postmaster nominations have been reported today from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads. In order to have them acted upon and to save the necessity of having the names printed on the calendar, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of those nominations, and that they be acted upon and confirmed now.



The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask that the nominations for Oklahoma go over until tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection—

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, what was the request?

Mr. BARKLEY. The request was that a large number of postmaster nominations which have been reported today but which are not on the calendar be confirmed. The Senator from Oklahoma asks that those for his State go over.

Mr. McNARY. The practice has been to have such nominations go to the calendar. There have been rare exceptions. However, a whole multitude would not constitute a rare exception. I believe they had better go over until tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nominations will be placed on the calendar, and will go over until tomorrow.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, does that mean that other nominations reported today will go over until tomorrow?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; they will all be placed on the calendar.

#### RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, December 16, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 15 (legislative day of November 30), 1942:

##### CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

Oswald Ryan, of Indiana, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board, for the term expiring December 31, 1948 (reappointment).

Hon. Josh Lee to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board, vice George Baker.

##### APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY

Capt. Daniel E. Barbey to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service to rank from the 1st day of June 1942.

##### MARINE CORPS

The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 15th day of May 1942:

Clifton M. Craig, Jr., a citizen of North Carolina.

William C. Ward, Jr., a citizen of North Carolina.

Thomas J. Webster, a citizen of Indiana.  
Ralph H. Currin, a citizen of North Carolina.

Harry W. Edwards, a citizen of California.  
Osborne K. LeBlanc, a citizen of Louisiana.

The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 6th day of August 1942:

George M. Foote, a citizen of Louisiana.  
Donald M. Love, Jr., a citizen of Pennsylvania.

William F. Feasley, a citizen of California.  
Harrison L. Rogers, a citizen of Missouri.  
Robert A. Campbell, a citizen of Illinois.  
Herbert I. McCoy, a citizen of Michigan.

The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 26th day of September 1942:

Michael Mosteller, a citizen of Georgia.

Benjamin F. Sohn, a citizen of California.  
Frank A. Kemp, Jr., a citizen of Colorado.  
William M. Spencer 3d, a citizen of Alabama.

Stewart A. Hurlburt, a citizen of New Jersey.

Jacques G. Fuller, a citizen of Illinois.  
James S. McDermott, a citizen of Kansas.

Bernard C. McKay, a citizen of Indiana.  
John B. Cohen, a citizen of New Jersey.

The below-named meritorious noncommissioned officers to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 17th day of October 1942:

First Sgt. Harold P. Williamson.  
Platoon Sgt. Anthony R. Epplin.  
Platoon Sgt. William C. Kranz.

The below-named meritorious noncommissioned officers to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 31st day of October 1942:

Platoon Sgt. Stancel W. Whatley.  
Platoon Sgt. Thomas A. Manion.  
Staff Sgt. Walter A. Dealey, Jr.

The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 31st day of October 1942:

John C. Younglove, a citizen of Montana.  
Verne C. Kennedy, Jr., a citizen of Illinois.  
John R. Grove, a citizen of Pennsylvania.

Walter G. Moeling 3d, a citizen of Pennsylvania.

Forrest S. Ockels, a citizen of California.  
John D. Tanner, a citizen of California.

David E. Wiley, a citizen of Oklahoma.  
Robert A. Scherr, a citizen of Wisconsin.

##### PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR NAVY

The following-named captains to be rear admirals in the Navy, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Francis W. Rockwell, December 8, 1941.  
Walden L. Ainsworth, June 30, 1942.

Charles A. Pownall, June 30, 1942.  
Marc A. Mitscher, June 30, 1942.

Robert M. Griffin, June 30, 1942.

The following-named commanders to be captains in the Navy, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

John Wilkes, January 1, 1942.  
Homer L. Grosskopf, April 1, 1942.

Thomas D. Warner, June 30, 1942.  
Ingolf N. Kiland, June 30, 1942.

Homer N. Wallin, June 30, 1942.  
Harold B. Sallada, June 30, 1942.

Walter C. Calhoun, June 30, 1942.  
Allen I. Price, June 30, 1942.

Thomas R. Cooley, June 30, 1942.  
Guy W. Clark, June 30, 1942.

John V. Murphy, June 30, 1942.  
William J. Malone, June 30, 1942.

John D. Crecca, June 30, 1942.  
William C. Wade, June 30, 1942.

Lawrence B. Richardson, June 30, 1942.  
Frank R. Dodge, June 30, 1942.

Owen E. Grimm, June 30, 1942.  
Thomas B. Inglis, June 30, 1942.

Earl E. Stone, June 30, 1942.  
Clifton A. F. Sprague, June 30, 1942.

Joseph J. Clark, June 30, 1942.  
Albert M. Bledsoe, June 30, 1942.

Wilber M. Lockhart, June 30, 1942.  
Christopher C. Miller, June 30, 1942.

Harry D. Hoffman, June 30, 1942.

The following-named lieutenant commanders to be commanders in the Navy, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Henri H. Smith-Hutton, January 1, 1942.  
Rogers Elliott, June 27, 1942.

Donald H. Johnston, June 30, 1942.  
Jesse G. Coward, June 30, 1942.

Sherman R. Clark, June 30, 1942.  
Halstead S. Covington, June 30, 1942.

John E. Murphy, June 30, 1942.  
John W. Harris, June 30, 1942.

Kenneth M. McLaren, June 30, 1942.  
George A. Holderness, Jr., June 30, 1942.

Robert C. Bell, June 30, 1942.  
Neil K. Dietrich, June 30, 1942.

James H. Thach, Jr., June 30, 1942.  
Church A. Chappell, June 30, 1942.

Henry C. Johnson, June 30, 1942.  
Fred W. Walton, June 30, 1942.

Curtis S. Smiley, June 30, 1942.  
Joseph E. Chapman, June 30, 1942.

Walter C. Holt, June 30, 1942.  
Daniel N. Cone, Jr., June 30, 1942.

Donald E. Wilcox, June 30, 1942.  
William P. McCarty, June 30, 1942.

The following-named lieutenants to be lieutenant commanders in the Navy, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

William J. Millican, January 1, 1942.  
Allan G. Gaden, March 1, 1942.

James H. Brett, Jr., June 1, 1942.  
Edwin J. S. Young, June 30, 1942.

Weldon L. Hamilton, June 30, 1942.  
Guy W. Stringer, June 30, 1942.

George H. Wales, June 30, 1942.  
Frank M. Adamson, June 30, 1942.

Robert B. McCoy, June 30, 1942.  
Frank Novak, June 30, 1942.

John W. Davison, June 30, 1942.  
John R. Moore, June 30, 1942.

Claude V. Ricketts, June 30, 1942.  
Laurence C. Baldauf, June 30, 1942.

Carl A. Peterson, June 30, 1942.  
Guy P. Garland, June 30, 1942.

Earl T. Schreiber, June 30, 1942.  
Edward J. O'Donnell, June 30, 1942.

Warner S. Rodimon, June 30, 1942.  
Benjamin Coe, June 30, 1942.

Joseph B. Duval, Jr., June 30, 1942.  
Stanley C. Strong, June 30, 1942.

Robert W. Denbo, June 30, 1942.  
Oscar M. Browne, Jr., June 30, 1942.

William E. Gentner, Jr., June 30, 1942.  
Harry W. Englund, June 30, 1942.

George N. Butterfield, June 30, 1942.  
Marvin H. Gluntz, June 30, 1942.

Harvey P. Burden, June 30, 1942.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Navy, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Robert B. Kelly, January 1, 1942.  
Karl E. Johansson, January 1, 1942.

Edward A. Michel, Jr., January 1, 1942.  
Francis M. Gambacorta, January 1, 1942.

Alan M. Nibbs, January 1, 1942.  
Dwight L. Moody, January 1, 1942.

James H. Brown, January 1, 1942.  
George H. Cairnes, January 1, 1942.

George D. Good, January 1, 1942.  
Herman J. Mecklenburg, January 1, 1942.

Alva W. Dinwiddie, January 1, 1942.  
Edwin H. Headland, Jr., January 1, 1942.

John W. Payne, Jr., January 1, 1942.  
Girard L. McEntee 3d, January 1, 1942.

Alberto C. Emerson, January 1, 1942.  
William B. Porter, January 1, 1942.

William C. P. Bellinger, Jr., January 1, 1942.  
August F. Weinel, January 1, 1942.

William M. Kaufman, January 1, 1942.  
Fred G. Bennett, January 1, 1942.

James C. Shaw, January 1, 1942.  
George M. Winne, January 22, 1942.

John Baumeister, Jr., February 1, 1942.  
Jewett O. Phillips, Jr., February 20, 1942.

James S. Gray, Jr., March 1, 1942.  
Archibald E. Teall, March 1, 1942.

Otis R. Cole, Jr., March 1, 1942.

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy, to rank from the 1st day of June 1942:

Richard J. Davis Vincent P. de Polx  
Earle J. McConnell George W. Scott, Jr.

Thomas W. Collins, Jr. Donald McR. Chisholm  
Edward L. Beach, Jr. Charles J. Kovaleski

John W. Dolan, Jr. Corwin G. Mendenhall,  
James C. Oldfield Jr.

Harry D. Helfrich, Jr. Lenard O. Reichel  
Norman S. Short

The following-named surgeons to be medical inspectors in the Navy, with the rank of commander, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Thomas H. Hayes, January 1, 1942.  
John N. C. Gordon, June 30, 1942.

Henry W. Patton, June 30, 1942.

Ocie B. Morrison, Jr., June 30, 1942.

John P. Brady, June 30, 1942.

David W. Lyon, Jr., June 30, 1942.

Bartholomew W. Hogan, June 30, 1942.

The following passed assistant surgeons to be surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant commander, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

William M. Silliphant, January 1, 1942.

Earl F. Evans, January 1, 1942.

Lyle A. Newton, January 1, 1942.

James L. Holland, January 1, 1942.

George F. Blodgett, January 1, 1942.

Robert A. Cooper, January 1, 1942.

Ralph K. Hoch, January 1, 1942.

Freeman C. Harris, January 1, 1942.

Robert C. Boyden, January 1, 1942.

Clifford F. Storey, January 1, 1942.

Frederick R. Lang, June 30, 1942.

Edward F. Kline, June 30, 1942.

Donald O. Wissinger, June 30, 1942.

Ralph D. Handen, June 30, 1942.

Ernest M. Wade, June 30, 1942.

Joseph L. Zundell, June 30, 1942.

Giffin C. Daughtridge, June 30, 1942.

Clarence F. Morrison, June 30, 1942.

James A. Price, June 30, 1942.

Ralph M. McComas, June 30, 1942.

George R. Hogshire, Jr., June 30, 1942.

Luther G. Bell, June 30, 1942.

The following assistant surgeons to be passed assistant surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, to rank from the 1st day of January 1942:

William T. Foley Edward A. Anderson

Chalmers R. Carr John W. Koett

Francis W. Gross James E. Eppley

George T. Ferguson Clement D. Burroughs

Ralph W. Geise Edward F. Ritter, Jr.

Road N. Grant

The following named passed assistant dental surgeons to be dental surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant commander, to rank from the 30th day of June 1942:

Victor A. LeClair

Merritt J. Crawford

Claude E. Adkins

The following named assistant dental surgeons to be passed assistant dental surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, to rank from the 1st day of January 1942:

Henry C. Knight Conrad H. Brandt

William E. Sanders Carl A. Veline

Claud M. Fraleigh

Paymaster Julian J. Levasseur to be a pay inspector in the Navy, with the rank of commander, to rank from the 30th day of June 1942.

The following named passed assistant paymasters to be paymasters in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant commander, to rank from the 30th day of June 1942:

Walter N. Gray

Jack O. Wheat

The following named assistant paymasters to be passed assistant paymasters in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Henry P. Knowles, January 1, 1942.

George S. Fuller, January 1, 1942.

Philip H. Fox, February 20, 1942.

Martin Miller, June 30, 1942.

Chaplain Alfred de Groot Vogler to be a chaplain in the Navy, with the rank of commander, to rank from the 1st day of July 1941.

Chaplain Frederick W. Mechling to be a chaplain in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant commander, to rank from the 30th day of June 1942.

The following named acting chaplains to be chaplains in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Otto D. F. Herrmann, August 1, 1941.

Samuel B. Bennett, January 1, 1942.

Boatswain Aubrey H. Gunn to be a chief boatswain in the Navy, to rank with but after ensign, from the 7th day of March 1942.

The following named machinists to be chief machinists in the Navy, to rank with but after ensign, from the 1st day of April 1942:

Orbie R. Treadway

Harold W. Packard

Carpenter Melvin J. Leed to be a chief carpenter in the Navy, to rank with but after ensign, from the 1st day of May 1942.

The following named assistant surgeons to be assistant surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), to rank from the date stated opposite their names, to correct the date of rank as previously nominated and confirmed:

Donald S. Smith, May 6, 1942.

Daniel R. Kohli, July 15, 1942.

Edward W. Kloth, July 15, 1942.

Erwood G. Edgar, July 15, 1942.

Pierre F. LaBorde, Jr., July 15, 1942.

Moffitt K. Holler, July 15, 1942.

Richard L. Merkel, July 15, 1942.

The following named officers of the Naval Reserve to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Navy, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Luke H. Miller, August 1, 1941.

Frank E. Rogozinski, August 1, 1941.

Edwin L. Kiem, September 1, 1941.

John E. Muldrow, October 1, 1941.

Thomas L. Conroy, October 1, 1941.

Thomas Robinson, November 1, 1941.

Frank D. Heyer, December 1, 1941.

Gerald H. Duffy, December 1, 1941.

Dale K. Peterson, January 1, 1942.

The following named officers of the Naval Reserve to be ensigns in the Navy, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Brainard T. Macomber, August 1, 1939.

Louis R. Gehlbach, September 1, 1939.

David A. Ratley, September 1, 1939.

William R. Leonard, Jr., October 1, 1939.

Alan H. Yates, October 15, 1939.

Joseph T. Watson, Jr., October 20, 1939.

John B. Wayne, October 20, 1939.

Charlie N. Conatser, November 20, 1939.

James H. Gerberding, November 20, 1939.

Frank M. Fisler, November 20, 1939.

Frank B. Gorman, November 20, 1939.

Frank O. Green, March 25, 1940.

Edward C. McCollon, Jr., March 25, 1940.

Robert M. J. Halman, March 25, 1940.

Henry C. Colee, Jr., March 25, 1940.

Donald W. Bowman, March 25, 1940.

David B. Rodman, April 15, 1940.

Ralph V. Wilhelm, April 15, 1940.

Robert C. Corlett, April 15, 1940.

Stuart T. Cooper, April 15, 1940.

Delwin A. Liane, April 15, 1940.

John M. Arbuckle, April 15, 1940.

Frank J. Hill, April 15, 1940.

Richard F. Buckley, Jr., April 15, 1940.

Henry B. Somerville, April 15, 1940.

Hugh D. O'Neill, April 15, 1940.

Ambrose J. Kinlon, Jr., April 15, 1940.

Marion K. Smith, June 7, 1940.

Raymond E. Moore, June 7, 1940.

Edward G. Stepanek, June 7, 1940.

Alton L. Gardner, June 7, 1940.

Hartsel D. Allen, June 7, 1940.

Joseph Garrett, June 7, 1940.

Warren Weeks, June 7, 1940.

Irving A. Kittel, June 7, 1940.

James A. Cooper, July 15, 1940.

James W. Hardy, July 15, 1940.

Donald E. McCoy, July 15, 1940.

William T. Sisson, July 15, 1940.

George "F". Poulos, July 15, 1940.

Charles C. Ainsworth, July 15, 1940.

John F. Schreffer, July 15, 1940.

William H. Pipkorn, July 15, 1940.

Marvin E. Barnett, July 15, 1940.

David A. Green, July 15, 1940.

Lukas V. Dachs, July 15, 1940.

William L. Pack, July 15, 1940.

William I. McGowan, July 15, 1940.

Thurlow G. Doyle, July 15, 1940.

Robert E. Farkas, July 15, 1940.

Jarlath J. Lyons, July 15, 1940.

Max P. Bailey, Jr., August 1, 1940.

Robert B. Clark, August 1, 1940.

Henry L. Anderton, Jr., August 1, 1940.

Edward Heck, Jr., August 1, 1940.

Harvey N. Hop, August 1, 1940.

Charles S. Coombs, August 1, 1940.

Robert P. Williams, August 1, 1940.

Everleigh D. Willems, August 1, 1940.

John F. Gray, August 1, 1940.

William D. Harrington, August 1, 1940.

Frank M. Graham, August 10, 1940.

Harry Hart, August 10, 1940.

Charles W. Knapp, August 10, 1940.

Donald G. White, August 10, 1940.

George M. Cole, August 10, 1940.

Fred C. Herriman, August 20, 1940.

Arnold E. Allemand, Jr., August 20, 1940.

Raymond L. Milner, August 20, 1940.

Benjamin F. Rowe, August 20, 1940.

Calvin T. Durgin, Jr., August 20, 1940.

William H. Chester, August 20, 1940.

John C. Gilbert, August 20, 1940.

William E. Rouse, August 20, 1940.

Arthur J. Schultz, Jr., August 20, 1940.

William J. Graham, September 1, 1940.

Frank W. Ackermann, September 1, 1940.

Robert V. Stolpe, September 10, 1940.

Dudley S. Billett, Jr., September 10, 1940.

DeWitt D. Chapman, Jr., September 10, 1940.

Dolive Durant, Jr., September 10, 1940.

Ray C. Tylutki, September 10, 1940.

Donald E. Anderson, September 10, 1940.

Eli B. Rogers, September 10, 1940.

Frederick W. Luebke, October 21, 1940.

Miles S. Whitener, October 21, 1940.

Wilbur W. Tittsworth, October 28, 1940.

John A. Palmer, October 28, 1940.

William P. Tyler, October 28, 1940.

Royal C. Carrington, October 28, 1940.

William T. Delaplane 3d, October 28, 1940.

Bruce E. Gunn, October 28, 1940.

Tony F. Schneider, November 1, 1940.

William S. Hardie, November 1, 1940.

Myrton T. Ebright, November 25, 1940.

Norman E. Petersen, November 25, 1940.

Frank J. Reiser, Jr., December 20, 1940.

The following named officers of the Naval Reserve to be ensigns in the Navy, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

John B. Kaye, October 23, 1939.

Franklin M. Haines, Jr., October 31, 1939.

George E. Thode, November 12, 1939.

Cyril G. Griffin, July 1, 1940.

Lawrence H. Young, July 17, 1940.

Barratt M. Wells, July 26, 1940.

Stephen C. Hale, Jr., August 1, 1940.

John D. Ainsworth, August 8, 1940.

Walter J. Rountree, September 26, 1940.

David M. Sharer, Jr., September 27, 1940.

Thomas F. Saunders, Jr., October 16, 1940.

Mark M. Gantar, December 16, 1940.

Ivan M. Simko, December 17, 1940.

Donald G. Wright, December 26, 1940.

Thomas B. Owen, December 30, 1940.

John Boyd, January 6, 1941.

William F. Babcock, March 4, 1941.

Joseph A. Roseman, April 5, 1941.

Boykin R. Dodson, April 19, 1941.

Giles F. Bunn, Jr., May 5, 1941.

John F. Collingwood, July 1, 1941.

Jordan R. McCann, January 6, 1942.

The following to be assistant surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Richard W. Worthington, Jr., May 26, 1941.

Robert G. Lehman, January 25, 1942.

John L. Wilson, January 25, 1942.

Joseph W. Colvin, May 6, 1942.

John W. Hope, May 6, 1942.

Winston J. Rowe, May 6, 1942.

Arch S. Russell, Jr., May 6, 1942.

William E. Dierking, May 6, 1942.

Theodore M. Cohen, May 6, 1942.

Clyde S. Stroud, Jr., May 6, 1942.

William J. Hall, May 6, 1942.

Felix P. Ballenger, May 6, 1942.

Clement F. Derezinski, May 6, 1942.



Earl G. Wolf, July 15, 1942.  
 Willson D. Tucker, July 15, 1942.  
 Emmett J. Riordan, November 12, 1942.  
 Harry Y. Hoffman, November 12, 1942.  
 Robert H. Bradley, Jr., November 12, 1942.  
 Carl E. Wilbur, November 12, 1942.  
 Ralph C. Benson, November 12, 1942.  
 G. P. R. Hudson, November 12, 1942.  
 John W. A. Woody, November 12, 1942.  
 Charles H. Gilliland, November 12, 1942.  
 Robert C. Burnham, November 12, 1942.  
 Woodman B. Pomeroy, November 12, 1942.  
 Vance E. Senter, November 12, 1942.  
 John R. Dyke, November 12, 1942.  
 Mark W. Wolcott, November 12, 1942.  
 Charles N. Curtis, November 12, 1942.  
 Albin W. Swenson, Jr., November 12, 1942.  
 Alfred A. Fracchia, November 12, 1942.  
 George J. Ulrich, November 12, 1942.  
 Carl H. Wallman, November 12, 1942.  
 Charles E. Pruitt, November 12, 1942.  
 Charles D. Vosburgh, November 12, 1942.  
 Leon H. Mims, Jr., November 12, 1942.  
 Robert Hayter, November 12, 1942.  
 Jean A. Sarraill, November 12, 1942.  
 Blake S. Talbot, November 12, 1942.  
 Sherburn E. Edgerly, November 12, 1942.  
 Louis de S. Shaffner, November 12, 1942.  
 Joseph E. Teitelbaum, November 12, 1942.  
 Jerome A. Moore, November 12, 1942.  
 Henry P. Phylfe, November 12, 1942.  
 Samuel P. Hicks, November 12, 1942.  
 Leslie V. D. Dill, November 12, 1942.  
 Robert C. Turner, November 12, 1942.  
 Bernard D. Stollman, December 8, 1942.  
 John E. Hall, December 8, 1942.  
 William G. Lawson, December 8, 1942.  
 Jesse R. Battenfeld, Jr., December 8, 1942.  
 James H. Boyers, December 8, 1942.  
 Paul W. Burke, December 8, 1942.  
 Bertrand L. Ellis, December 8, 1942.  
 Clyde W. Norman, December 16, 1942.  
 William A. Dinsmore, Jr., January 9, 1943.  
 William A. Wulfman, January 9, 1943.  
 Henry J. Roberts, January 16, 1943.  
 John E. Promer, January 17, 1943.  
 William A. Robie, February 20, 1943.

## POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

## ARKANSAS

Lois R. Patterson, Arkadelphia, Ark., in place of D. G. Lamb. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.  
 Charles F. Elza, Benton, Ark., in place of C. F. Elza. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.  
 John Freeman Graddy, Clinton, Ark., in place of J. T. Whillock. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.  
 Elmer McHaney, Marmaduke, Ark., in place of Elmer McHaney. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.  
 Jesse T. Howard, Smithville, Ark., in place of J. T. Howard. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

## CALIFORNIA

J. Everett Osborne, Camarillo, Calif., in place of Della Carrillo, resigned.  
 Edgar G. Eckels, Chino, Calif., in place of E. G. Eckels. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.  
 Alice E. Schleck, Eldridge, Calif., in place of A. E. Schleck. Incumbent's commission expired June 8, 1942.  
 Thomas F. Helm, Lakeside, Calif., in place of T. F. Helm. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.  
 Mary M. Franklin, North Fork, Calif., in place of L. F. Franklin, resigned.  
 Merle H. Wiswell, Roseville, Calif., in place of M. H. Wiswell. Incumbent's commission expired June 1, 1942.  
 Minnie B. Pharr, Scotia, Calif., in place of M. B. Pharr. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.  
 Wesley L. Benepe, Sebastopol, Calif., in place of W. L. Benepe. Incumbent's commission expired May 27, 1942.

Roy Bucknell, Upper Lake, Calif., in place of Roy Bucknell. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

## FLORIDA

George C. Blume, Jacksonville, Fla., in place of W. D. Jones, deceased.  
 Frank B. Stewart, Melrose, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.  
 Coy K. Duff, Mims, Fla. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

## GEORGIA

Belle B. Hicks, Cadwell, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.  
 James H. Hart, Ellaville, Ga., in place of J. H. Hart. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.  
 Joseph R. Gay, Gay, Ga. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.  
 Olin W. Patterson, Lumpkin, Ga., in place of O. W. Patterson. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

## IDAHO

Hazel Norma Russell, Kuna, Idaho, in place of M. K. Will, resigned.

## ILLINOIS

Edwin B. Watrous, Hampshire, Ill., in place of David McGrath, resigned.  
 Clarence A. Stout, Mound City, Ill., in place of B. B. Hood. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.  
 Hezekiah Reeves, Pulaski, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.  
 H. Wilson Harshman, Rockport, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

## INDIANA

Roy Biberstine, Bluffton, Ind., in place of Frank Ulmer. Incumbent's commission expired March 25, 1942.  
 Stanley P. Downing, Carbon, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.  
 Ervin Sell, Columbia City, Ind., in place of Ervin Sell. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.  
 C. Frank Youngblood, Covington, Ind., in place of D. V. Clem. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

## IOWA

Price G. Thompson, Casey, Iowa, in place of P. G. Thompson. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

## KANSAS

Faye R. Bergin, Bogue, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.  
 Alexander A. Niernberger, Collyer, Kans., in place of A. A. Niernberger. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.  
 Mildred F. Atkinson, De Soto, Kans., in place of M. F. Atkinson. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.  
 Henry J. Kuckelman, Everest, Kans., in place of H. J. Kuckelman. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.  
 Charles F. Mellenbruch, Fairview, Kans., in place of C. F. Mellenbruch. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.  
 Homer I. Shaw, Galesburg, Kans., in place of H. I. Shaw. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.  
 Charles H. Ryan, Girard, Kans., in place of C. H. Ryan. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.  
 A. Isabella Marty, Longford, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.  
 Carl Eickholt, Offerle, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.  
 George F. Riley, Soldier, Kans., in place of G. F. Riley. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.  
 Clyde N. Swartz, Turner, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.  
 Samuel E. Holt, Uniontown, Kans. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.  
 Margaret A. Schafer, Vermillion, Kans., in place of M. A. Schafer. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.  
 James L. Morrissey, Woodston, Kans., in place of J. L. Morrissey. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

## KENTUCKY

Mary K. Listermann, Cold Spring, Ky. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.  
 Walter McKenzie, Eubank, Ky., in place of Walter McKenzie. Incumbent's commission expired March 30, 1942.  
 Willis Conley, Garrett, Ky., in place of Willis Conley. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.  
 Katie Mullins, Mount Vernon, Ky., in place of Katy Mullins. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.  
 Mason E. Burton, Somerset, Ky., in place of M. E. Burton. Incumbent's commission expired June 1, 1942.

## LOUISIANA

William W. Tubb, Dubach, La., in place of W. O. Woodward. Incumbent's commission expired March 16, 1941.  
 Olivier Dufour, Marrero, La., in place of Olivier Dufour. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

## MAINE

Laval R. Lebel, Brunswick, Maine, in place of G. W. Leonard, retired.  
 Sumner A. Fickett, Millbridge, Maine, in place of S. A. Fickett. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

## MASSACHUSETTS

Joseph E. Langlois, Dodgeville, Mass., in place of T. F. Daly. Incumbent's commission expired February 16, 1941.

## MICHIGAN

Harry J. Lynch, Gaylord, Mich., in place of H. J. Lynch. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.  
 Edwin C. Kraft, Nashville, Mich., in place of E. C. Kraft. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.  
 Paul Grobaski, Pellston, Mich., in place of C. P. Murray. Incumbent's commission expired July 28, 1941.  
 Merrill Hillock, Pickford, Mich., in place of Merrill Hillock. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.  
 George A. Ruddy, Plainwell, Mich., in place of G. A. Ruddy. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.  
 Mary Jane Hageman, Unionville, Mich., in place of F. A. Kolb, transferred.

## MINNESOTA

William L. Ward, Anoka, Minn., in place of W. L. Ward. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.  
 Alta V. Mason, Blue Earth, Minn., in place of A. V. Mason. Incumbent's commission expired June 3, 1942.  
 Elmer J. Larson, Cokato, Minn., in place of E. J. Larson. Incumbent's commission expired June 12, 1942.  
 Raymond E. Mumm, Cologne, Minn., in place of L. J. Dols, retired.

## MISSISSIPPI

William A. Pepper, Belzoni, Miss., in place of W. A. Pepper. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.  
 Hettie E. Harper, Soso, Miss. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

## MISSOURI

Foster R. Moore, Brashear, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.  
 Boyd W. Harwood, Jr., Camdenton, Mo., in place of Nettie Morgan, resigned.  
 Rose Virginia Gorham, Cardwell, Mo., in place of J. M. Warren, removed.  
 W. Donald Dale, Elmer, Mo. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.  
 Walter Manley, Liberty, Mo., in place of Walter Manley. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.  
 Andrew Earl Duley, Newtown, Mo., in place of A. E. Duley. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.  
 Donald H. Sosey, Palmyra, Mo., in place of D. H. Sosey. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.  
 Chalmer R. Ethington, Powersville, Mo., in place of H. F. Allen, resigned.

Walter M. Horton, Robertson, Mo., in place of F. J. Albers, removed.  
 Raiman L. Coates, Sarcosie, Mo., in place of V. F. Whisner, transferred.

## NEBRASKA

William Stuart Campbell, Waterloo, Nebr., in place of W. S. Campbell. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

## NEW HAMPSHIRE

Carroll H. Metcalf, Alstead, N. H., in place of S. J. Moore, retired.

## NEW JERSEY

Myra Pulis, Campgaw, N. J. Office became Presidential July 1, 1940.

Harry F. Sawyer, Far Hills, N. J., in place of H. E. Poulson, retired.

Merritt J. McAlinden, Hopewell, N. J., in place of E. P. Stout. Incumbent's commission expired March 10, 1941.

George M. Gibson, Moorestown, N. J., in place of G. M. Gibson. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

## NEW MEXICO

Selah C. Hoy, East Vaughn, N. Mex., in place of S. C. Hoy. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

## NORTH CAROLINA

Annie E. Black, Rocky Point, N. C., in place of J. B. Hayes, transferred.

## NORTH DAKOTA

Wesley P. Josewski, Maxbass, N. Dak., in place of W. P. Josewski. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Frank S. Kenny, New England, N. Dak., in place of H. A. Borcharding, deceased.

## OKLAHOMA

Lee Kennedy, Broken Bow, Okla., in place of Lee Kennedy. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Jesse W. Keith, Haileyville, Okla., in place of J. W. Keith. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Hugh Johnson, Hugo, Okla., in place of Hugh Johnson. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Rex T. Strickland, Madill, Okla., in place of R. T. Strickland. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Tom L. Pike, Weleetka, Okla., in place of T. L. Pike. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

## OREGON

Ermel H. Hosley, Chiloquin, Oreg., in place of E. H. Hosley. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

John S. Spike, Echo, Oreg., in place of J. S. Spike. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Ruby I. Loundree, Sandy, Oreg., in place of R. I. Loundree. Incumbent's commission expired June 18, 1942.

Oscar Edwin Marvin, Wallowa, Oreg., in place of O. E. Marvin. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

## PENNSYLVANIA

Dorothy M. Nice, Esterly, Pa., in place of C. H. Adams, deceased.

Raymond R. Kinsinger, Halifax, Pa., in place of R. R. Kinsinger. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Helen G. Mack, Lafayette Hill, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Rebecca Campbell, Midway, Pa., in place of Rebecca Campbell. Incumbent's commission expired April 29, 1942.

Elmer G. Corter, Mill Hall, Pa., in place of E. G. Corter. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

John M. Langan, Moscow, Pa., in place of J. M. Langan. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

William G. Loy, Newport, Pa., in place of W. G. Loy. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Gerald H. Rickerson, North Warren, Pa., in place of G. H. Rickerson. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Emma R. Dexter, Roulette, Pa., in place of E. R. Dexter. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Charles J. Trexler, Windgap, Pa., in place of C. J. Trexler. Incumbent's commission expired June 9, 1942.

## SOUTH DAKOTA

Frank S. Ryan, Kimball, S. Dak., in place of C. W. Richards, deceased.

## TENNESSEE

Amos F. Hassell, Collinwood, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

James F. Bryan, Munford, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

J. Green Hawks, Ralston Station, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

## TEXAS

Edgar L. Watson, Athens, Tex., in place of E. L. Watson. Incumbent's commission expired March 28, 1942.

Louis C. Nordt, Damon, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Perry H. Sparks, Hamlin, Tex., in place of Z. H. Bonner, transferred.

William E. Votaw, Jarrell, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Annie M. Martin, Kemah, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Allen L. Burditt, La Ward, Tex. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Georgie F. Morgan, Leary, Tex. Office became Presidential April 1, 1942.

Ellis M. Bush, Lytle, Tex., in place of J. L. Kay, retired.

Harriet M. Rust, Vanderbilt, Tex., in place of J. J. Dutton, removed.

## VIRGINIA

John H. Bowdoin, Bloxom, Va., in place of J. H. Bowdoin. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Norma H. Fulton, Drakes Branch, Va., in place of N. H. Fulton. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

C. Coleman Curtis, Lee Hall, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Roy Hockman, Maurertown, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Lloyd Sullenberger, Monterey, Va., in place of Lloyd Sullenberger. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Annie G. Whitten, Montvale, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

William C. Nelson, New Church, Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Samuel F. Atwill, Sr., Reedville, Va., in place of S. F. Atwill. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Elijah S. Slate, South Boston, Va., in place of E. S. Slate. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Janet L. Freeman, Stony Creek, Va., in place of W. B. Cocke, Jr., resigned.

Fannie B. B. Sale, Tappahannock, Va., in place of F. B. B. Sale. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

## WASHINGTON

Archie Constable, Seaview, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Joseph Horrigan, Kenmore, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

I. Wells Littlejohn, Pateros, Wash., in place of I. W. Littlejohn. Incumbent's commission expired April 1, 1942.

Jessie M. Severyns, Sunnyside, Wash., in place of J. M. Severyns. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

William W. Moffitt, Naselle, Wash. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

## WEST VIRGINIA

Jessie M. Shields, Barrackville, W. Va., in place of O. R. Conaway, resigned.

Mabel H. Campbell, Newburg, W. Va., in place of F. W. Horchler, retired.

Martha L. Britton, Pocahontas, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

Elijah F. Midkiff, West Hamlin, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1942.

## WISCONSIN

Vernon A. Martin, Amherst, Wis., in place of V. A. Martin. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Alex G. Mohr, Cambria, Wis., in place of A. G. Mohr. Incumbent's commission expired May 31, 1942.

Velma C. Grossman, Dale, Wis., in place of V. C. Grossman. Incumbent's commission expired April 21, 1941.

Melvin I. Dunn, Fall River, Wis., in place of M. I. Dunn. Incumbent's commission expired June 8, 1942.

Albert E. Hansen, Mendota, Wis., in place of A. E. Hansen. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Oscar M. Rickard, Merrillan, Wis., in place of O. M. Rickard. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

Frances M. Kirby, Montreal, Wis., in place of M. E. Meade, retired.

Maurice A. Reeves, Fewaukee, Wis., in place of M. A. Reeves. Incumbent's commission expired June 23, 1942.

John V. Nickodem, Princeton, Wis., in place of J. V. Nickodem. Incumbent's commission expired May 25, 1942.

Edward A. Peters, Waterloo, Wis., in place of E. A. Peters. Incumbent's commission expired May 31, 1942.

## WYOMING

Jack R. Gage, Sheridan, Wyo., in place of J. C. Jackson, removed.

## CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate December 15 (legislative day of November 30), 1942:

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Louis E. Goodman to be United States district judge for the northern district of California.

## REJECTION

Executive nomination rejected by the Senate December 15 (legislative day of November 30), 1942:

## POSTMASTER

Robert Leo Quirk to be postmaster at Washington in the State of Louisiana.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 15, 1942

The House was called to order at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Blessed be the holy name of the Lord, our God, in whom are centered our hopes, our longings, and our aspirations. We pray Thee to fill our minds with wisdom and our hearts with grace that our faith may spring like the eagle that soars to meet the sun. Breasting these heavy days, do Thou inspire us to seek the floors of spiritual depths, ceasing to be satisfied with the things visible because we have seen the glory of God, the source of the lustrous pearls of eternal truth.

Thou who art the good Shepherd, who leads into pastures of love and by the still waters of peace and restful quietness, waken in our waiting souls an unutterable quietness which is the living bread of the universe. We ask Thee to impart to all blind mortal eyes the loveliness



and the beauty which make them immortal, inspiring them with an awareness that however forbidding the day and dark the night, these only preclude the brightness of a dawn which is to be. Blessed Lord, we pray for those who are about through the thunder of life's battle, waiting for the sun to set as they sit on the western piazza; we clasp hands with them as they face the temple of silence and reconciliation where the burdens and the enmities of life are forgotten and buried. Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by inserting a speech delivered by the Honorable Henry Morgenthau, Jr., Secretary of the Treasury, at Winston-Salem, N. C., on Saturday evening, December 12, 1942, on the occasion of the awarding of flags to firms that had gone over the top in the bond sale program and 90 percent of whose employees had cooperated in the purchase of savings bonds.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in four instances.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include a speech delivered by Hon. Sergio Osmeña, Vice President of the Philippine Commonwealth, delivered at Los Angeles, Calif.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include a letter from former Senator Robert L. Owen.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

#### THE RATIONING OF GASOLINE

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the one element most necessary in connection with the rationing of gasoline is to simplify the whole procedure and to decentralize authority into the hands of local boards. At present great numbers of appeals are necessary because regulations do not give local boards authority or discretion to use their own judgment. In the case of farm transportation local county war boards should be able to decide how much gasoline is needed by various farmers. In the case of other transportation local ration boards should at once be given increased authority and discretion. They should be urged to use this authority and discretion in a constructive way—not warned that they will get into trouble if they make possible errors of judgment.

Such programs as this ration program are brand new, especially to the American people. They are believed necessary if we are to make sure of our supplies of rubber for the winning of this total war. There is no use shutting our eyes to the fact that they are foreign to the traditional American way of doing things, and the only salvation of the situation is to get their administration down into the local communities as much as can possibly be done. In this connection Congress should be careful to allow sufficient funds to at least give the local boards enough money to operate efficiently and to make it possible to have local boards in just as many communities as is reasonable.

#### QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ON THE TAX BILL OF 1942

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Printing I report back (Rept. No. 2739) favorably, without amendment, a privileged resolution (H. Res. 576) authorizing the printing of the manuscript entitled "Questions and Answers on the Tax Bill of 1942" as a public document, and ask its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the manuscript prepared by Representative DANIEL A. REED containing an analysis of the Revenue Act of 1942 entitled "Questions and Answers on the Tax Bill" be printed as a House document.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record and to include an article published in the National Republic.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

#### LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the legislative program today, and any other special orders, I be permitted to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I asked unanimous consent to have inserted in the Record an economic analysis prepared by the Raw Materials National Council. The Public Printer has notified me that this will cost \$112.50. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed nevertheless.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

#### LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative business and other special orders, I be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

#### IRRATIONAL RATIONING

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

[Mr. PLUMLEY addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Record on the subject of maldistribution of meat and the shortage of meat in Massachusetts, and to include a telegram and a letter from Widetzky & Kruger, counsel for the New England Wholesale Meat Dealers Association at Boston.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

#### NATIONAL CONDITIONS

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute to read a paragraph which I wrote in 1901, illustrating my position now on international relations as ranking minority member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, and to extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

[Mr. EATON addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

#### FOREIGN POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. RICH addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

#### OIL RATIONING

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

[Mr. DEWEY addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and to include therein an address I made on the one hundred and fifty-first anniversary of the ratification of the Bill of Rights, which we celebrate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and to include therein an editorial on the late Louis E. Kirstein, which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor of Friday, December 11, 1942.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by inserting a radio speech I made on station WEBD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by including a radio address I delivered.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on a general topic.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### CIRCUIT COURT JUDGES

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 2655) to amend the Judicial Code to authorize the Chief Justice of the United States to assign circuit judges to temporary duty in circuits other than their own, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

#### CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2655) entitled "An act to amend the Judicial Code to authorize the Chief Justice of the United States to assign circuit judges to temporary duty in circuits other than their own," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its amendment.

HATTON W. SUMNERS,  
FRANCIS E. WALTER,  
U. S. GUYER,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,  
JOHN A. DANAHER,  
TOM CONNALLY,

*Managers on the part of the Senate.*

#### STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2655) entitled "An act to amend the Judicial Code to authorize the Chief Justice of the United States to assign circuit judges to temporary duty in circuits other than their own," submit the following explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon in conference and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The purpose of the bill is to permit judges of the circuit courts of appeals to serve in circuits other than their own when designated for that purpose. The effect of the House amendment was to make necessary a request by the senior district judge before a district judge could be designated and assigned by the senior circuit judge or circuit justice to sit in another district where assistance may be needed.

The conferees were of opinion that since the House amendment concerned itself with assignment of district judges, and not circuit judges as is the purpose of the bill, the amendment should be withdrawn from consideration in connection with the present bill. The House recedes from its amendment.

HATTON W. SUMNERS,  
FRANCIS E. WALTER,  
U. S. GUYER,

*Managers on the part of the House.*

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by inserting in the RECORD a short article.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### OVERTIME PAY FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, we are about to consider a resolution to provide for overtime compensation of a certain group of Federal employees. If we fail to provide for this group of people during the sunset hours of the life of the Seventy-seventh Congress, it will be a sad commentary.

I have just returned from a recent trip to South Carolina where I visited my own navy yard. I talked with numbers of the civilian guards at the gates of this tremendously expanded institution. I talked to the marine colonel in charge of these men. I learned that these guards had to work without relief or rest at a ridiculously low base pay of \$125 a month.

I also talked with numerous classes of 4-B employees in all branches of the Federal service in Charleston, a great many of whom receive only \$105 a month salary, and many of these told me of the long hours they were being compelled to work without additional remuneration when the lowest class of laborers receive in excess of \$200 a month including their overtime.

I happen to be a member of the Naval Affairs Committee of this great body. I am thoroughly familiar with the attitude of the Navy Department in this regard. This morning I talked with Mr. Piczet, civilian personnel director of the Navy Department, and he told me that failure to provide for these employees would be a serious blow to the war effort.

Remember, and this is to their eternal glory, no strikes have ever marred their illustrious record. No slow-downs have ever been charged to their hands. It should therefore be the happy privilege of every Member of Congress to take up the battle for these people and do justice where justice is due, and say to them, "well done," your Congress with grateful hearts will keep faith with you.

[Here the gavel fell.]

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an article by Walter Meachim on the centennial of the Oregon Trail, Opportunity To Revitalize Ideals.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a brief letter.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### OVERTIME PAY FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, our fellow Member, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS], has brought up a subject which truly is worthy of the closest attention on the part of the membership of this House—overtime and increased pay for Government employees. It seems to me most unfortunate that the Government of the United States should be requiring thousands of its citizens whom it employs to work 68 hours in some instances on 44 hours' pay at wages established 15 years ago, whereas in the same communities private industrial employees have been receiving both overtime pay and a 15-percent increase in wages under decisions of the National War Labor Board.

They are performing exactly the same type of labor. It seems only fair that Government officials should look out for those who are working for the Government just as much as they look out for those working for private employers who are paid the entire amount of their salaries or wages indirectly by the Federal Government. In some cases we find that persons who have been enjoying overtime pay up until November 30 have now had it taken away from them. They could have been working elsewhere at higher wages than they got from the Government, but they stayed with the Government because of the hope held out to them that they would receive overtime pay and increases in pay. This Congress should pass such legislation as is necessary to accomplish these purposes on a fair basis.

[Here the gavel fell.]

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a short item.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. PIERCE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

#### ISSUANCE OF PATENTS FOR CERTAIN LANDS TO THE TOWN OF FLETCHER, OKLA.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2393) amending the provisions governing the issuance of patents for certain lands to the town of Fletcher, Okla.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.



Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I am not going to object, because I understand this land comprises just a few lots far removed from any oil fields.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. That is correct.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this the bill that was brought up yesterday?

Mr. ROBINSON. Yes.

Mr. RICH. Was the gentleman who objected yesterday notified that the bill would be brought up this morning?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. He was notified.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior may issue a patent in fee simple to the town of Fletcher, Okla., under section 22 of the act of May 2, 1890 (26 Stat. 91; 43 U. S. C. 1094), for the tracts in that town reserved for parks, schools, and other public purposes, without inserting in the patent the condition required by such section that the lands shall be maintained for the purposes mentioned.*

Sec. 2. The proceeds derived from the sale of such parcels of land shall be used by the Town Board of Fletcher, Okla., first, to repair and improve the water system in such town; and, second, to construct a town building containing, among other things, a fire station, jail, and town hall.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therewith certain quoted material.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter addressed to the Transportation and Investigating Board.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] may extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address by Raymond Moley.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

MRS. J. C. TOMMEY

Mr. MEYER of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 7171) for the relief of Mrs. J. C. Tommey, with a Senate amendment, and agree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$3,500."

The Senate amendment was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### THE SECOND WAR POWERS BILL

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the Ways and Means Committee considered the bill H. R. 7762, the first version of the Doughton bill, which, after consideration, was apparently tabled on the theory that the President would have too much power in the suspension of laws dealing with tariffs and immigration. Why the proviso dealing with aliens was inserted in that bill referred to the Ways and Means Committee, I do not understand, except that it has been the practice in the last few years to refer bills to committees that ordinarily would not handle some of the subjects in the bill. We have seen the practice grow up, and bills sent to the Judiciary Committee that rightfully belonged to the Committee on Immigration, and vice versa. Other committees besides mine are complaining, and I hope and trust the leadership of the House will stop this practice. If it is to be continued, they might as well abolish some of the committees and refer all the bills to one committee, and let it pass upon all legislation.

True, I did not show too much interest in the first draft of this bill (H. R. 7762), but when it was superseded by H. R. 7832 and then tabled I was so amazed that I decided to look into the matter. I have examined the testimony before the committee carefully. Why the Ways and Means Committee refused to give the President these powers in time of war has not been explained by anyone. It has not been explained by any member of the committee. I cannot see why the President as Commander in Chief should not have the power, as requested, to move certain material and certain people and do other things for war purposes. The President cannot come to the Congress every time occasion and need for such powers arise and ask for these powers. There has to be someone responsible at the head to carry on.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. For a brief question.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that the Ways and Means Committee, when it held its hearings, learned that everything proposed in the bill was already being done under the general law?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Well, that may be so, I will not split hairs with you on that, but at the same time your Chief Executive asked for that power to be given to him by law.

Mr. KNUSTON. Is that all the reason the gentleman needs, that the Chief Executive asked for it?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I will follow through.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. For a brief question.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. The gentleman must believe, and I ask him if he does believe, that the Congress should surrender all of its powers to the Chief Executive? If it does, should the Congress not go home and let the President run the whole show?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. The answer is no. I feel very strongly on this subject and would be the last person to advocate that Congress surrender any of its powers.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. That is what the gentleman proposes.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I am arguing that an emergency exists, we are at war, and the President cannot come here every day asking the Congress for something in order to be able to carry out his duties as the Commander in Chief of our armed forces.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. May I say to the gentleman that the thing he calls an emergency simply does not exist, because the things that were proposed under this bill H. R. 7762, as I have told the gentleman already, are now being done and have been done right along under the laws, regulations, and general practice.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. That may be so. Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Well, it is so.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Whether it is being done in accordance with law or not, I do not know. It may be done in accordance with some Executive order. But that is not the point I am calling your attention to.

Mr. Speaker, as the newspapers pointed out, one of the important factors in having H. R. 7832 tabled was—and I want my colleague to listen to this—was the testimony of one Marvin K. Hart, who appeared before the Ways and Means Committee in opposition to this bill. He calls himself president of the New York State Economic Council, and his testimony was based upon the plea not to give any more power to "that man." He is one of the professional Roosevelt haters who—as his record bears out—will oppose anything that he thinks the President may want. That was one of the experts who testified before the Ways and Means Committee.

Who is this Marvin K. Hart? He has been publicly accused of being a Fascist and of associating with Fascist sympathizers. Some of the people he has been friendly with have been indicted by the grand jury investigating Nazi sympathizers. The American lady—I cannot think of her name at the moment—who broadcast Nazi propaganda from Berlin, went to Spain with a letter of introduction from this great American, Mr. Hart. It is easy to understand that a person with such associations and such friends is opposed to anything the President may do to defeat our enemies.

What is this economic council? It is nothing but a private organization which claims to be conducting investigations of Federal and State Governments as their acts affect private enterprises. Why did not the committee find out more about this gentleman, who appointed him and

who made him the police guard of the Nation and the States? What is he investigating, what does he know, and who is financing his outfit?

Mr. Hart expressed his great satisfaction with that part of the war-power bill which prevents the President from suspending any immigration restrictions, but he states that this bill will give the President too much authority. We know this to be a misinterpretation of the provisions of H. R. 7762 as the President could not have possibly suspended the immigration laws under that bill. Mr. Hart's further contention was that the bill would permit the President to send out American citizens against their will to some foreign country on any pretext whatsoever, and the Committee on Ways and Means fell hook, line, and sinker for that. Can you picture that the President would send out any citizen that he wanted to send out just to get rid of him? This interpretation clearly shows the personal antagonism Hart has against the President. Where does Mr. Hart get his ideas? There is no such thing in contemplation, nor has there been any discussion on any such proposition. But Mr. Hart goes on further and claims that a large number of refugees have come here and he infers that they had entered illegally, not in conformity with our immigration laws and in excess of our quotas, and he continues to state that if the Congress will investigate it will find that some of them hold Federal positions in New York City and elsewhere in preference to American citizens.

Mr. Speaker, as a Member of this House and the chairman of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, I declare this statement to be a brazen and premeditated lie made for the purpose of creating distrust and disunity among our people. In the first place, as any Member of this House can easily find out by checking with the State Department, the established quotas under our immigration laws have not been filled for years. As far as his second point is concerned, you can also ascertain that there are a number of boards at the Visa Division—boards composed of people from the State Department, the War and Navy Departments, Justice Department, and F. B. I.—who have to pass upon each individual case before any person is granted a visa. Now, as far as his accusation is concerned, that refugees take away Federal positions from American citizens, every one of you here knows that under the laws we passed, no Federal agency is permitted to employ an alien. You know that under the law no Federal money can be used as salary for an alien. Yet no Member challenged Mr. Hart when he made such a ridiculous statement.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Probably some refugees would not have come into this country in the past 2 years if it were not for the individuals who have been instrumental in having them come over to this country. Certain employers of labor have simply discharged American citizens

and they have put on these new people in order that they might have work so that they could maintain themselves and the fellow who brought them over would not be responsible. That is causing more trouble in the gentleman's own city than anything else that I know of. So it is a difficult situation in which you find yourself because of what has happened in the last 2 or 3 years.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I do not think my friend got my point in the first place, and, in the second place, I do not think the question propounded has any material bearing. I have stated that Mr. Hart told the Committee on Ways and Means that so-called refugees are holding Federal positions. I challenge Mr. Hart or any other Member of this House or anyone in the country to point out to me any aliens holding Federal positions. I would be in favor of removing them very quickly, and of penalizing those responsible for putting them there.

Mr. RICH. These refugees would hardly be placed in Federal jobs unless they were able to speak English.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I am talking about what Mr. Hart said before the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. RICH. I am not talking about Mr. Hart.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Well, I am.

Mr. RICH. I was just trying to show the gentleman the difficulties and the troubles we are having.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. If the gentleman will permit me to proceed, I will try to cover that if I have time.

So far as aliens holding positions in the War Production Board or other Federal bureaus is concerned, I say it was an unfair and completely false statement that Mr. Hart made before the Committee on Ways and Means, but his statement had great influence in persuading that committee to table the bill.

In the first instance, most refugees who came to the United States in recent years had money, I may say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, if he wants to have the story. No alien came to this country in the last few years who did not prove to the satisfaction of the interdepartmental committee of the State Department that he would not become a public charge if admitted. Hart must know that our immigration laws are very clear on this point, and they have been enforced very strictly, that no persons can come into this country looking for jobs.

Mr. RICH. Let me say this to the gentleman.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Do not interrupt me. Let me finish my thought. I will give the gentleman a chance later.

Mr. RICH. I do not want to interrupt the gentleman.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I do not want to be discourteous, but if it is the gentleman's purpose to clear up this question, that is what I am trying to do.

As a result, only certain people with certain qualifications and under certain restrictions provided for not only by the consul in the city where the alien came from, but by the State Department, which sits in judgment and passes upon these applications, could enter this coun-

try. The moment a man claimed he was going to get a job in this country he could not enter the United States. Hart knew it, but he did not tell that to the Committee on Ways and Means, and the Committee on Ways and Means did not take the trouble to find out.

In other words, Hart tried to point out to the Committee on Ways and Means that, if you passed this war powers bill, the President would flood the country with aliens. He is too clever a man not to have known that this was not true, but he was playing up the present antialien feeling and got away with it.

The aliens who did come into this country—and I say this honestly and fairly and understand the question fully—have brought wealth into this country and have created industries to employ American citizens. A lot of them have created new employment possibilities for American citizens instead of taking jobs away from them. The statistics will prove that. Just communicate with the Department of Commerce, and they will give you all of that information, that these aliens coming from the Lowlands come in here with wealth and have created industries and are employing American citizens. I do not say that all of them are doing it, and I am not a bit concerned, but why not have the truth?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. I did not say that we should put up bars and prohibit anyone from coming into our country. I think that would be wrong. However, I do think our first consideration should be to take care of all our people in America.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. RICH. Then, if we can open our doors to good, reputable citizens who want to come here, that is one thing. Certainly, however, after this war is over, if we have anything that would leave the bars down, we shall have all the riffraff of all the countries of the world coming here. That would not do, and I would oppose that to the limit.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. RICH. I believe the gentleman would oppose it, too.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Certainly I would. The laws today are so strict that it is difficult to bring anybody in. I am just trying to correct the erroneous impression created by the testimony of Mr. Hart, this great economist, who represents nobody but himself and a group of other gentlemen in New York, a self-sustaining corporation that could investigate your business and any business without having been asked to do it, if they decided that you were in conflict with their interests.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Yes.

Mr. RICH. I think they were afraid of giving that power to the President, because they did not know what he would do, and they were afraid to grant the power to him.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Oh, the gentleman and I know very well that the President



would not do anything of that kind. He knows that in his heart just as well as I do. If it is going to help the war situation, no man is going to deny the President any right that he asks in that respect. We are here all the time, and if something is wrong, we can take care of the situation.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. For just one observation. No matter what misunderstanding followed the original letter which came up, where the word "person" was included, there never was any intention to suspend the immigration laws, and we all know that. It was intended to meet peculiar situations, that in turn could have an effect on the conduct of the war. There were many individual situations that arose, and the power to meet such peculiar situations might be beneficial to our country. There was never any intention to suspend the immigration laws. The President himself said so, and despite the general impression that has been created, the record should show that there was never any intention to suspend the immigration laws. I would oppose that myself. There was only the intention to give power to meet peculiar situations that might arise from time to time, where certain things might be done that would be helpful to our country in connection with the conduct of the war.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Yes.

Mr. RICH. How about the tariff?

Mr. McCORMACK. It was not intended to suspend the tariff laws, but it was to meet individual situations, individual cases, the import of matters of material interest to the United States, where he would have to use lend-lease money to pay the tariff to bring the goods in.

Mr. RICH. And we have to pay the tariff with lend-lease money.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman think that should be necessary?

Mr. RICH. No, I think that is wrong.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes, and that was the situation it was aimed to meet.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

#### AUTHORITY TO RECESS THE HOUSE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order for the Speaker today to declare the House in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. I suppose that is with the usual 15 minutes' notice of reconvening?

Mr. McCORMACK. Oh, yes; with the usual notice of 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by including a very complimentary editorial that appeared in the Bos-

ton Post, entitled "The Seventy-seventh Congress."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by including an address delivered some years ago by Mr. J. D. Ross.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and to include a newspaper clipping.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and to include a resolution passed by the C. I. O.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the Delegate from Hawaii [Mr. KING] for 15 minutes.

#### HAWAII—FAREWELL TO CONGRESS

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, the Hawaiian language has enriched our American idiom with the word "aloha," which means affectionately both "hello" and "farewell." Today, I say to all of my friends and colleagues of the House a final aloha. As some of you know, I have reentered the service of the United States Navy, from which I resigned some years ago, and I will shortly be called to active duty. I withdrew from the congressional election upon my return home to Hawaii some weeks ago, which it happened was just after the primary election that renominated me.

I am somewhat embarrassed to be saying my farewells to my colleagues at this time, because I understand it had been assumed that I had already reported for active naval service. I believe the news accounts of my withdrawal from the campaign for reelection gave that impression, and several of my colleagues have already expressed their regrets at my departure and paid me many kind compliments.

I am now turning up after the eulogies, in defiance of Emily Post's dictum that when good-byes have been said, one should keep on going, and not linger for a too prolonged parting. But I had to come back to complete my term as Delegate; finish up my present job before taking on the new assignment; turn over as clean a slate as possible to my successor; and last but not least, extend my aloha and thanks to you all in person.

After 8 years in this House, I would not want to leave without at least a word of appreciation for the many kindnesses shown me during my four terms. I have therefore asked for these few minutes before the Seventy-seventh Congress passes into history to express my sincere thanks to the Members of this House for their uniform courtesy to me, and for the sympathetic manner in which they have received my representations on behalf of my constituency.

I am leaving Congress to reenter the naval service the day after my term expires, and hope and expect to be ordered to duty in the Pacific area. I decided

upon this course in the conviction that as a former Navy man my contribution to the winning of the war would best be made in the naval service.

I was nominated for appointment to the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis in 1905, by Hawaii's then Delegate, Prince Jonah Kuhio Kalaniana'ole, and served in the United States Navy nearly 20 years. I resigned my commission as a lieutenant commander in 1924, when peace reigned, and when I felt free to return to my native Hawaii, to live and raise a family, in the belief that no major war would occur in the remainder of my active lifetime.

You can imagine my feelings on December 7 last year. The greatest war of our history had been thrust upon us. My own Hawaii was attacked and my people found themselves in a combat zone living under drastic martial law. The Navy became engaged in an all-out struggle against the forces of ruthless and treacherous foes on all the seas of the world. Two of my Annapolis classmates were killed at Pearl Harbor, and among the men who died at their posts in that holocaust were undoubtedly many old shipmates of former years.

If there had been some way for me to return to active service sooner, I would have done so. I could not in justice to Hawaii leave my post during the first months of the war with so much to be done to help my community prepare itself for further attack. But Uncle Sam had invested a substantial sum in my training years ago, and as the civilian situation in Hawaii became better clarified I felt free to seek active naval duty, if my services could be utilized.

To succeed me Hawaii has elected Mr. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON, son of a distinguished former Governor of Hawaii, a graduate of the University of Wisconsin, and for several years the Washington correspondent of a Philadelphia newspaper. Since his return to Hawaii after this mainland experience, JOE FARRINGTON has taken an active part in our community life, has succeeded his father as the publisher of one of our leading newspapers, and has served 8 years in the Senate of Hawaii. He comes well qualified for the position of Delegate, and will make his own place in the Congress. I only ask in his behalf that my friends in this House give him a cordial welcome, as my personal friend as well as successor.

Mr. Speaker, as I look back over the 8 years of my service I can truly say that Hawaii has received fair and considerate treatment from the Congress. There have been one or two disappointments, but I am sure future Congresses will correct these exceptions. I have fought consistently for the principle of complete equality of treatment for the Territory of Hawaii with the several States in all legislation of national application, whether such legislation imposed a burden or granted a benefit. It is a source of gratification to me that in nearly every case that has come up during my service here Congress has accepted that principle as its guide.

In regard to legislation of specific application to Hawaii, I am happy to say that the Congress has in practically no

instance refused to approve measures desired by my community. As a Territory much legislation local in character must be approved by Congress. I have found the Committee on the Territories, through which most of this legislation passes, invariably sympathetic and helpful and wish to extend to its chairman and members my sincere thanks for their cooperation.

With the help of this committee, several measures have been enacted into law which strengthened the program for the rehabilitation of the native Hawaiian people that Congress initiated over 20 years ago at the request of Delegate Kalanianaʻole.

As a part Hawaiian myself, I have been deeply interested in the success of this project. It is one of my regrets upon leaving that a bill authorizing the construction of an irrigation system for the benefit of the Hawaiian homesteaders under this program is likely to die in the other body after having been approved by the House. Apparently the war precludes action at this time, and I can only hope that this legislation will be revived at some more auspicious time.

Mr. Speaker, it has been an honor to represent the Territory of Hawaii in this great legislative body. It is an experience which I shall treasure for the remaining years of my life, an experience which has confirmed my belief in and devotion to our democratic way of life.

I have had the high privilege of being the sole Representative in Congress of my community for 8 years. I am proud to have earned that distinction as a result of four elections in which I have stood for office.

A Delegate representing a Territory and without a vote in the House or in committee needs the help of his colleagues to an even greater extent than a Representative. This help I have received in full measure.

As a Republican, I have somewhat taken for granted that the Republican membership of the House would help me when I needed help. In this expectation I have never been disappointed.

But it is to me a fine commentary on the spirit of fairness with which this body functions that the majority membership of the House, especially the chairmen and majority members of the various committees on which I have served, have granted me equally friendly consideration. For this I wish to express my heartfelt thanks to the Democratic Members of the House.

I value very highly the personal friends I have made here on both sides of the aisle. If I am unable to see each of you before we scatter, may I ask that you accept this message of farewell, of aloha, as meant for every one of you.

I want, however, to say a word of special tribute to the Delegate from Alaska [Mr. DIMOND]. Because our respective Territories often have a community of interest, the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. DIMOND] and I have cooperated closely together through my four terms. He works one side of the aisle while I work the other, and thus we cover both sides. I know I but express the sentiments of this entire body when I pay my

respects to him as one of the ablest and finest men in this House and one for whom I have a warm affection and a high regard.

To you all, ladies and gentlemen, aloha a nui loa me ke malu no ke Akua, a hui hou kakou. In other words, my affectionate regards and very best wishes for your continued success and happiness in life. I hope we meet again in happier days when peace and decency again reign throughout the world. Until then, God bless you all, and aloha.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING. Yes.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, before the gentleman leaves, I wish to say to him that, as one member of the committee on which he has served, the Committee on Territories, I have found it to be one of the finest experiences of my life to have had the pleasure of meeting and working with the Delegate from Hawaii. He has not only been a faithful Member, and he has represented his district with faithfulness and ability, but he has won the respect, admiration, and love of every single one of us, I am sure, who have served with him on that committee. We will carry with us to the end of our lives that very happy experience.

Mr. KING. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I cannot refrain from paying tribute to my good friend from Hawaii, SAM KING. We have all great admiration and affection for him. He has been very diligent in his service to his country, and he has accomplished many things for the good of the people who have elected him to this body. We realize that, as an old Navy man, a graduate of Annapolis he naturally would want to reenter the service and join the armed forces. Therefore, reluctant as we are to see him go, we honor him for his choice, and we do wish him the best of luck. We trust when the war is over he will return to us safely, either as a Delegate to this great body in which he has rendered such fine service, or perhaps as Governor of his own beloved islands.

Mr. KING. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING. Yes.

Mr. KEFAUVER. The Delegate from Hawaii has spoken of the success he has had in connection with certain legislation affecting Hawaii. The record shows that the gentleman's statements in that regard are very modest. My experience with the gentleman is that he himself deserves a great deal of credit for that success, because he has very vigorously attended to the legislation in which he was interested, and upon leaving the Congress he should find much satisfaction in knowing that he has done a fine job representing his constituents. All of us shall miss the gentleman greatly.

Mr. KING. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that any man at any time from any place could have represented beautiful Hawaii, with all its many important interests, with a greater degree of efficiency and faithfulness than has the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. KING].

The fidelity with which Hon. SAMUEL W. KING has represented his constituents is a matter of public record. It is a record of achievement of which he may well be proud.

I do not hesitate to say that by the force of our colleague's character and ability he has added to the prestige of all of those whom he has had the honor to represent. It is my firm belief that the influence of our friend Hon. SAMUEL W. KING will continue to be a potent factor in favor of all future legislation which may come before Congress relating to the welfare of the people of Hawaii. It is to the credit of the people of Hawaii that they fully recognized and appreciated the sterling qualities of their distinguished Delegate by sending him 8 consecutive years to speak for them on the floor of the greatest legislative body in the world.

It is typical of the high character and patriotism of our colleague that in the hour of his country's peril he should decide to return to the Navy in which he served with distinction during the First World War.

I am only one of many in the official life of Washington who regret that our good friend Sam and his most charming and cultured family cannot remain with us, but it is my hope and it is the hope of a host of other sincere friends of Delegate KING and his delightful family that their separation from us will be only for the duration and that the duration will be short.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Utah.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the gentleman from Hawaii, and to the House that I have served on one committee with the delegate from Hawaii. I think the people of Hawaii are losing one of the ablest legislators who has served in this House during the 10 years I have been here. I feel that the United States Congress is losing an able man. I appreciate the fact that on very many problems which have been before the Committee on the Territories the gentleman from Hawaii and I have sometimes been on opposite sides of the table and have had divergent views on the problem under consideration, but he has always manifested extreme fairness. With his unusual ability and his great force of argument, he has been able to convince the people with whom he has been dealing that his cause had at least one very important side, and he has usually been able to convince not only a majority of the committee, but all members of the committee, that his side was right.

I want to tell the gentleman that the people you have represented so ably will miss your presence in this body, and the Members of this body will also miss you.



We do not like to see you go, but we hope you will enjoy yourself in the work you have now chosen, and we all take consolation in the fact that you will still be in the service of our country.

Mr. KING. The gentleman from Utah is very kind.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING. I will be glad to yield if I have time.

Mr. HOPE. I have had an excellent opportunity to observe the diligence and ability with which the gentleman from Hawaii has represented his constituency during the time he has been a Member of this body. During all of that time we have served together on the Committee on Agriculture. The principal industry of Hawaii is agriculture. Our distinguished friend has done an outstanding job in his representation of this great industry. His knowledge of the needs of his people and his persuasiveness in presenting his viewpoint and position have been of untold benefit to the Territory and its people.

The Delegate from Hawaii has no vote in this body. What he accomplishes must be by the force of his personality and by his ability to convince others of the merits of his contentions. Our friend possesses these qualities in a remarkable degree. He is an able legislator whose ability is reflected in the results which he has secured. He has endeared himself to all of us. No Member of this body has more friends. We can only reconcile our sorrow at his leaving us by the thought that he will still continue in the service of his country in a capacity where his ability and experience will be of great value. He will distinguish himself in war as he has in peace. We wish him God-speed and good fortune.

Mr. KING. I thank the gentleman from Kansas very greatly.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KING. I gladly yield to my distinguished friend from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I regret very much to see the gentleman from Hawaii leave this body, but I know that he is going into a service of his Government where he can be of very constructive value. I am satisfied that our friend SAM KING will lead the way into Tokyo.

Mr. KING. Of course, I might say to the gentleman that nothing would please me more than to be in the van in the parade to Tokyo.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. SAM KING has the love and respect of all Members of the House and Senate, just as he has had the love and affection of his fine constituency. I do not know of any man since I came to the Congress who has better served his constituents than our friend, Delegate KING. His services will be missed. The many kindnesses and courtesies which he has shown to us are only exemplified by his noble spirit and his endeavor to perform a very important task in taking care of all the affairs of the people of Hawaii.

When he leaves here we want to wish him aloha and Godspeed in anything he may do and hope that some day SAM KING

will be back with us in the House of Representatives.

In saying farewell to our friend from Hawaii I also desire to add a personal aloha for Mrs. King, his gracious and charming wife. Those of us who have had the pleasure of becoming acquainted with Delegate and Mrs. King feel sad over their departure from Washington, but we are happy in the knowledge that we can count on the everlasting friendship of this truly American couple. Aloha to our friends.

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much. I had not intended to inspire this second wave of eulogies, but I do appreciate the kind sentiments expressed by all of you. Although I do leave with regret, I know you will appreciate that I am looking forward with a great deal of pleasure to putting on the uniform that I wore for nearly 20 years. Thank you all, and aloha.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Hawaii has expired.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] is recognized for 25 minutes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a statement, and I also ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I shall now make.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARNESS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to permit me to submit a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. HARNESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the other special orders of the day I may address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### AN APPRAISAL OF THE LAST ELECTION

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the Seventy-seventh Congress is drawing to a close. It has been the Congress that declared the United States at war with the Axis Powers. It has held office during a part of what is unquestionably one of the greatest turning points in all the history of mankind.

#### VICTORY WILL BE WON

At the moment and as long as the war lasts the future of our country rests primarily with the men and the commanders of our Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps. There have been those who have criticized their work and predicted dire consequences for the arms of America. Their tongues are silent today. They know, as the rest of us know, that the military forces of America are doing their primary part of this total war job true to the best traditions of America's naval and military history.

When the war will be won no man can predict. Some have apparently assumed that the occupation of French North Africa brought us to within easy striking distance of the final victory. I am afraid they have misled the people. That

occupation was a brilliant maneuver—brilliantly executed. It may well bring our forces to a vantage point from which telling blows may be struck. It is not in and of itself such a blow.

That such blows will be struck and that they will ultimately shatter the military power of the Axis is our confident faith. When that time will come we do not know. All we as common citizens can know is that every possible effort must be bent to bring the war to the speediest possible victory.

#### REASONS FOR OUTCOME OF ELECTION

Meanwhile, on November 3, there took place one of the important elections of American history. It has been interpreted in as many different ways as there are interpreters.

Of one thing, however I feel certain. The action of the voters was not a demand that reactionary policies were to be pursued. Rather it was an expression of the will of the American people that their Government draw closer to them, that it demonstrate a greater understanding of their real spirit and attitude, that it repose greater responsibility on them in their local communities, that it come closer to demanding equality of sacrifice for all, that it prosecute the war with greater efficiency and less confusion, that it anticipate problems and maladjustments instead of waiting until popular demand becomes so great that action on the part of the Government is forced by it.

#### FOR WINNING THE WAR THERE HAS TO BE CONCENTRATION OF RESPONSIBILITY AND UNIFICATION OF ECONOMIC COMMAND

Perhaps also the elections in part reflect the fact that many men and women have begun to feel that governmental power in itself is likely to take from people certain things of greater value than what it can give. They have seen anew the value of freedom, of constitutional democracy as a form of government, and they are now engaged in the most tremendous task perhaps in all the history of human politics and thought, namely, the task of attempting to reconcile liberty on the one hand with a reasonably decent security for the common man on the other. In a nutshell that is the task this generation of Americans must perform and they must perform it promptly enough so that the issue of this great conflict will not be lost and the sacrifice of our people and the other peoples engaged with us will not be wasted.

But if I am correct that this was in part the feeling of the people in this election, then I would add a note of warning. For one fact is perfectly obvious—neither this Nation nor any other nation can possibly fight a total war without a profound disturbance in its normal way of living; nor can any democratic people effectively meet the challenge of totalitarian nations in war without organizing their own production and economic activity in the most complete possible way.

The determination of Members of Congress and of the people generally to prevent the growth of governmental agencies and powers is a healthy sign for the future of America, but it cannot safely determine our action at the pres-

ent time. For there simply is no way to match the power of the totalitarian nations unless there is concentration of both responsibility and authority in the hands of governmental agencies, which can streamline and mobilize the resources of our country in an altogether effective way for the prosecution of this war. It is our evident duty to see that such power is not abused or arbitrarily exercised and deliberate duplication and unnecessary personnel be eliminated. To oppose such a giving of authority to selected and responsible agencies at the present time may well result in a weakening of the war effort. Rather should we insist on an increasing simplification of the line of command of our economic effort on the home front and upon a removal of the confusion which has existed in the past due to a duplication of authority between various agencies and sometimes to a competition between various governmental agencies for the use of production facilities, for materials, for manpower, and in numerous other ways.

We must fight the war through to victory, and we have got to do all things necessary to that end. Our convictions and desires with regard to the time when peace shall return will be no less profound or effective then if we recognize the necessities of this total war and concentrate our every effort upon winning it.

This speech, however, is intended as a forward look, not a backward one. All I shall have to say is said on the assumption that the war comes first in all of our considerations. My remarks are an attempt—and I hope an important one—to appraise the situation in which we now find ourselves and to help to build some of that hope upon which the spiritual and moral strength of our people, as well as those of other nations, must ultimately depend. For it is not to enthrone old and outworn privileges that this war is being fought. No. It is being fought by people in order that they may know and that their children may know a better day than mankind has ever seen. Never can we lose sight of this fact, nor the companion fact, which is that this is not simply a military conflict, but more than that is a great contest between two diametrically opposite systems of life and government for the allegiance of people throughout the world. To truly win this war, therefore, will require the giving to those people of a basis for hope of a world society in which a Hitler will be impossible and in which exploitation of one people by another will be ended.

The election just passed has not changed the fundamental forces that move through the hearts and minds of the American electorate.

It has not altered the ideals they cherish nor the hopes for the future that lead people to make the sacrifices of war without complaint.

#### TWO BASIC DEMANDS OF THE PEOPLE

The people are still saying:

"Two things this war must produce—

"First. A lasting peace—so that war shall not return upon the next generation of young men.

"Second. The growth and the development of the democratic way of life and the American ideal of equality of opportunity for every class and group and kind of people."

The importance of political developments in America in the next 2 years will be found not in whether sitting Members of Congress are returned to office but in whether the destinies of our country are guided by men who are committed without reservation to accomplishing at the close of this war what was not accomplished at the close of the First World War.

The future of America and all she has stood for through the years will hang in the balance and be determined by what is done by whomsoever guides our ship of state in the period just after the war.

Pure oppositionism frequently wins elections—especially in times of trouble and hardship for the people.

But it is a weak reed indeed upon which to depend for the rebuilding of the whole world.

I shall not attempt to draw blueprints of world organizations or to describe how I believe machinery should be set up for the solution of future international problems.

Those problems will not all be solved in a moment of time.

But I shall say one thing: Those who seek the support of the American electorate in the months immediately ahead owe to that electorate straight-out answers to these questions: Is it proposed that America shall play her full part in building the peace that must follow this war? Is it proposed that this Nation shall help actively to prevent a repetition of the tragic series of events that intervened between the two wars? Is it proposed that we shall remember only Pearl Harbor? Or is it proposed that we shall remember also the League of Nations and Manchuria and Ethiopia and Hitler's march into the Rhineland?

To those questions the American people will expect an answer. May it be the right answer from whomever they select to govern this Nation in 1944.

#### PEACE DEPENDS ON FREE DEMOCRATIC GOVERNMENT AND FREE GOVERNMENT DEPENDS ON SOLUTION OF ECONOMIC PROBLEMS

But it is not alone a matter of the peace treaty that will be at stake. There is a basis and root for peace. Peace can only be secure among peoples who are free. And the freedom of peoples within their own nations depends, directly, as the history of the past 2 decades amply demonstrates, upon whether or not the economic problems of the people can and will be solved by democratic and free governments and without the sacrifice of liberty. Three great things human beings have always sought. Three instructive urges have been put into us by Him who made us.

First. The will to live—to sustain life—the search for food, clothing, shelter for oneself and family.

Second. Security and safety in these things—peace and the opportunity to live out one's life fully.

Third. Freedom of the spirit. And as civilization advances men and women put more and more value on the third of these things.

Totalitarian governments arose because clever and ambitious men persuaded the people of certain nations that by the sacrifice of their freedom they could gain jobs and food and security.

And by the same token the strength and safety of free and constitutional government upon which in turn our hope of peace depends are only to be found in proving to one's own people and to the world that freedom and security are not incompatible and that there can be full employment and jobs for all within the framework of a society of freemen.

In the next Congress there will be need as there has not been for a decade for men who will not be afraid to speak out on behalf of the common people, the poor, and those whom it is easy to forget. There will be need of men who, though they constitute a decided minority of the membership, will tell the story of the unsung heroism of ordinary Americans of every race and kind on the battlefield, in the shops, on the farms, and on the highways of the world. There will be need of Members who will constantly be showing their colleagues the fundamental truth of democratic life and government which is that it is not the rich or the great or the powerful who ultimately compose a Nation's strength in either war or peace but rather the great silent army of men and women who through the ages have paid the price in blood and sweat and tears and who have never asked for more than a chance to live and earn a decent and fairly secure competence for themselves and their families. This group of men will be important. For our work will be that of building the hope of millions who are called upon to bear the burden and heat of the battle, and the war effort at home. The time has come, I believe, when it must be said in plain and simple words that the hope of the people can be rested neither in the establishment of governmental bureaus and the extension of centralized governmental controls which the New Deal in certain phases has meant nor, certainly, in the chronic and wholly negative opposition to the New Deal which has characterized the forces of reaction throughout the country and within the Congress.

This war is being fought first to destroy the greatest threat to human liberty and decency, to the right of people to call their souls their own that the world has ever known. But like all periods of great suffering it has got to issue into a better and more hopeful world for all sorts and conditions of men. To believe that the onerous controls and executive governmental powers which this war has brought upon the people of America are going to be perpetuated is to deny the existence of every strong current of popular feeling in this Nation and to overlook what I judge to be the strongest passion of the overwhelming majority of the Congress. But to propose that as an alternative the people



be told that they can no longer look for any sort of wise and constructive action from their Government to protect the weak and restrain the strong, to motivate full production and employment, to use its taxing and its monetary powers to assure producers—especially farmers—of a full market for their products—to say that none of these things will be done, but that we shall simply return after the war to a vacuous nirvana of normalcy, wherein the devil will again have license to take the hindmost in every economic race, that indeed is a gospel of despair.

#### THE MIDDLE ROAD

There is another way—a golden mean if you will. It is a way whereby both freedom and security can in reasonable degree be achieved in our country. It is to be distinguished from some aspects of the New Deal in that it will emphasize the motivation of full production and employment by dynamic measures, but will avoid to the greatest possible extent measures which involve direction or control of the economic life of the people by Government agencies and bureaus. Its principal tasks will be monetary and fiscal ones, though it will never neglect for an hour the basic duty of any democratic government which is to break the hold of irresponsible monopoly power over any aspect of the people's lives.

And so now I come to what I may call a sort of confession of my political faith. I believe that freedom and decent security for the people are not incompatible. I believe it is possible to find and apply with salutary effect the proper functions of government in the solution of economic problems without extending either governmental power over the people or causing them to become dependent upon paternalistic action by government. I believe the achievement and maintenance of a state of abundant production in peacetime is possible if it is based on a resolute maintenance of a proper balance between that production and a full free flow of consumer buying power. The one rule that must never be departed from is this—whenever the potential supply of needed goods and services exceeds the demand for them then the demand should always be increased, and under no circumstances should the supply be artificially reduced.

#### OUTLINE OF PROGRAM FOR ECONOMIC HEALTH AFTER WAR

Full employment, abundant production, and equally abundant consumption can be achieved without governmental economic dictatorship or governmental direction and control of our economy. The job of Government must be the motivation of full employment and production, not by increasing governmental power but by consistently, effectually, and regularly passing that power on into the hands of the 130,000,000 people of the Nation. In the first line of economic defense belong, therefore, such measures as will make certain that American consumers will have a constant buying power large enough in total volume to keep our machinery of production going at a high enough level to provide full employment. Such measures include: First, creation

by the Nation itself of such additional money or national credit as is required by expanding production, thus ending the present practice of borrowing the Nation's own credit at interest from private banks; second, amendment of the Social Security Act so as to make it a dynamic force channeling otherwise idle buying power into the active stream of consumer demand instead of a static individual insurance program; third, the fearless use of taxation as a means of penalizing the arch crime of a free economic order, namely, holding the medium of exchange out of use; fourth, measures which will assure the farmer that the abundance of his production will not be the measure of his woe but rather that he will find a full home market among those who, to put it simply and undramatically, need more food; and, finally, fifth, use of publicly owned yardsticks to break the grip of monopoly in fields of natural monopoly such as electric power and the vigorous enforcement of antitrust laws to accomplish the same purpose in fields where competition is possible as the method of protecting the public interest. And there is always the hope that the cooperative movement among consumers, farmers, and other groups will—without Government favors or subsidy of any kind—attain sufficient economic strength to exert the sort of salutary influence on our economic life that it has exerted in Scandinavia. If these things are done, we will develop a clear distinction between the proper fields of governmental action in a democracy and the phases of economic life in which Government will not enter. And every one of the measures I have briefly suggested will stimulate greater economic activity and afford increased economic opportunity to the people generally.

Democracy can be defined as a state where the rights of individuals are determined by law and custom, and not by the arbitrary decisions of an individual or a special group. It is important to remember this.

The key to the building of a world of both freedom and security after the war is to be found in the difference between two different kinds of governmental action and policy. On the one hand are those measures which make citizens depend upon government; on the other are measures which open to citizens the way to help themselves. On the one hand are measures which give to Government departments or bureaus actual and intimate control over the economic activity and business of the people as a means of attempts to solve their problems such as unemployment; on the other hand are measures whereby the economic activity of the Nation as a whole is stimulated in dynamic fashion so that none need go without a job. The difference is between direction and control, on the one hand, and dynamic motivation of full employment and full production on the other.

One example of this difference is to be found in the field of prices. The kind of price control we have today—and which, in view of the circumstances of this war period, is necessary—leads inevitably to

the building up of a great enforcement organization, to constant interference and interposition by the Government in the business of millions of American citizens. This kind of price control cannot be had without a very considerable amount of bureaucratic control.

There is another way, one that has never been sincerely tried. It is the method of so controlling the total volume of money in circulation as to keep a constant and stable relationship between that volume of money and the flow of goods through the markets of the Nation. Most important of all—in peacetime—it is required, if we would use this method, that a nonpolitical public body composed of outstanding citizens and created as an agency of the Congress have and exercise the power of creating money and employing, without increasing debt, the national credit of the American people. Use that power, Mr. Speaker, and you can maintain the over-all buying power of the Nation in such manner as to support a market that will be large enough to keep our people employed. Furthermore, over a period of time the national debt of the American people can in this manner be gradually reduced without bringing on a constriction of economic activity by overburdensome taxation.

The one essential economic task of government then, according to my belief, is to give a virtual guaranty to the producers of the Nation that the demand of consumers for their products will not fail. And this need not increase the power and authority of government. It can be accomplished by the passing on in accordance with laws of Congress of economic power to the 130,000,000 people of America. For example, if in the face of threatening unemployment we set up a huge emergency work program—as we shall have certainly to do if we do not develop another answer beforehand—then it becomes inevitable that the power of giving or withholding jobs and employment as to many American citizens will rest with a group of governmental officials. Again there is another way. Suppose the idea of social security were extended until we had established a system of old-age pensions for all classes and groups and all sections of the Nation, as well as a system of insurance for the protection of the disabled, the parentless child, and the widowed mother. Then, according to law, we should have a means of sustaining on a reasonable basis the buying power of these citizens in our midst who cannot or properly should not be employed. It gives to government no economic power over the people to pay an old-age pension. No; it passes on to people in every corner of the Nation the economic power that resides ultimately in the Nation as a whole.

#### MONOPOLY POWER VERSUS FREEDOM

But I believe it is quite impossible for us to achieve both freedom and security for the people of this Nation in the future unless irresponsible monopoly power, wherever it raises its head, is subjected to the most effective and relentless measures by the Government for the purpose of protecting the rank-and-file American citizen from its operations.

In saying this, I have reference first to monopoly finance with its control over the industrial life of America, and to monopoly industry with its power to block the opportunity of the small man to engage in particular lines of business and its even more dangerous power to artificially restrict production and hold prices at unjustifiable high levels. But I also have reference to monopoly power of small numbers of people within organizations of any sort over the fate of great numbers of people who must make their living in this country. The Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice under Mr. Thurman Arnold has made an earnest effort to enforce the law, to break monopoly power, and to protect the opportunities and rights not only of all businessmen but also of other American citizens. The work of this Division has never received the kind of wholehearted support which it should have had from other branches of the Government. In the future, after this war has been won, it must have that kind of support. For to permit monopoly power to stand and still to talk about freedom is nothing short of hypocritical, whereas to free all the forces of production and progress is the very essence of democracy. It may require some sort of major operation for us to reconstitute the small businesses of this country after the experience of this war. In my humble judgment, our task would be rendered much less difficult if decisions with regard to production programs for the war were not so largely in the hands of representatives of the largest businesses and in many cases the greatest monopolies in this whole Nation. Nevertheless, we must pick up the problem from where it stands at the end of the war, doing meanwhile what we can to mitigate the fate of the small business people. Unless, however, these small business firms can be got back on their feet and into active operation again after the war, we shall face a problem most severe in its magnitude, and one which possibly may spell the end of any true economic freedom in this country.

Another thing which must be done in this particular field also, in my judgment, is that there must be legislation on the statute books of our country—and I believe it should be put there now—which would render it illegal for anyone to restrict the use of patented processes by others. The first step in this direction is contained in legislation already before this body and introduced by myself. It was introduced in the Senate by the senior Senator from Illinois. All this legislation seeks to do is to make it an offense for anyone to restrict interstate commerce by unreasonably refusing to grant licenses for the use of patented processes.

The function of Government in protecting the weak and restraining the strong is one of its most important duties, according to my belief. This duty it must not flinch from in the years that lie ahead. It must make certain that the rank and file of all types of organizations, whether they be organizations of farmers, businessmen, or la-

borers, are in a position to actually control the destinies, the policies, and the operations of those organizations. This, it seems to me, is the constructive approach to many of these problems, which unfortunately some Members of the Congress have attempted to deal with by means of various types of penal statutes, which inevitably will do more harm than good.

#### A FULL MARKET FOR FARMERS AND HEALTH FOR CHILDREN

I believe in the American family-sized farm. I think that the small, independent farmer has always been, both in this country and in other countries, the very backbone of a democratic society. But I believe that certain measures for his protection have got to be taken, not measures that will increase the power of Government over him but measures that will prevent economic forces beyond his control from driving him to the wall. I believe he has a right to be assured of a fair, full market for the abundance which he can produce. We have got to be done with situations where we say in effect that, though an abundance of food has been produced by our farmers and though there is still need and hunger in this and other lands, nevertheless we are not intelligent enough to know how to bring this food and the hungry people together. I can conceive of a program whereby we would say that we were going to do away with undernourishment among all the school children of this Nation, and where we would purchase from these farmers, at a fair cost of production price, those products of food which they had produced and which would mean so much to the balancing of the nutrition and to the health of the children of this great Nation. Here, again, I would handle such a program, not through Federal hand-outs to anybody but only as is now done, through local groups of people who sponsor the program and arrange for the use of the food in a fair and just manner. But I would do this job on a scale so that it would reach all children throughout this Nation. After all, it is hardly reasonable to believe that a child that has had insufficient nourishment can take advantage of the fine educational system which our country boasts. The maintenance of decent prices for agricultural commodities to the farmer is a better and more constructive way to meet his problem than by giving him benefit payments from the Federal Treasury. But it will not be right merely to stop the benefit payments unless we are prepared to put something better in their place. By means of the method I have already suggested, as well as others, we should make certain that the abundance of the farmer's production will not be his destruction, but rather the means of enabling him to feel that he is building up a stronger and healthier nation and, indeed, a stronger and healthier world recognized for 25 minutes.

#### HOPE IN COOPERATION

And there are scattered through this Nation at this very hour far-sighted and earnest men and women who without the slightest help from Government in any way are working out the answer to their

problems as farmers, consumers, borrowers and savers, users of electricity, and purchasers of insurance by the method of cooperation. Their work is to me one of the brightest stars of hope that we can see through the darkness of this war.

As best I knew how I have worked through my three terms in Congress for the rights and interest of the common people of America. I shall not lay that work down however the winds of political fortune may blow. I have worked for the opportunity of people to work and earn a living, for the solution of unemployment, for the removal of the burden of unnecessary debt from the shoulders of the people. To these things I shall continue to be dedicated.

The time has come, not in spite of but because of the war that engulfs the world, for clear statements by us all of the things we shall seek to accomplish in tomorrow's world—a world being born out of the travail of this war.

The time has also come when old political shibboleths and phrases must be discarded and when men must stand forth for principles and policies which they can state clearly so the people can understand and judge.

In this hour of crisis for our country the thing most needed it seems to me is a straightforward and forthright movement among the people for the establishment as a result of this war of simple justice between nations and of true equality of opportunity among the citizens of our country. Nor does such a movement need to employ the methods of governmental bureaucracy to gain its ends. There are other and better ways as I have shown. If we interpret the outcome of the last election as a mandate from the American people to attempt to turn the hands of time backward and to commit our Nation for a second time to some kind of impossible laissez-faire normalcy after this war has been won we shall not only misconstrue the temper and spirit of the people but we shall deal a body blow to the true cause of the United Nations in this war.

That we must not do.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PIERCE] is recognized for 25 minutes.

#### A FORESTRY PROGRAM

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker—

I think that I shall never see  
A poem lovely as a tree.  
A tree whose hungry mouth is pressed  
Against the earth's sweet flowing breast.  
A tree that may in summer wear  
A nest of robins in her hair;  
Upon whose bosom snow has lain,  
Who intimately lives with rain.  
Poems are made by fools like me,  
But only God can make a tree.

—Joyce Kilmer.

The author has made a deep impression upon all nature lovers who have read his beautiful lines quoted above. In early boyhood, along the banks of the Illinois River, I learned to love and admire the stately walnut trees and the butternut trees, for in the fall they bore nuts that I enjoyed. The white oaks looked to me like monstrous growths. As



a young man I moved toward the West. I learned to admire the forests of Colorado, uncut as they were 60 years ago. Then I found my home in the great Pacific Northwest, and admired the ponderosa pine of the high plateaus, the Douglas fir, the cedar of the coast range, and finally it was my pleasure to see and wonder at the redwoods of California and southern Oregon. I shall never forget my many visits to the Port Orford cedars of the Pacific coast. Much of that unique stand has now been harvested and been purchased by the Japanese Government. It lies buried in the bays of that far-seeing kingdom, to be brought forth years in the future, to enter the channels of commerce. When Governor of the State of Oregon, I took every opportunity to visit the forests that I might see the trees in their primitive beauty—one of God's great gifts to man.

#### ORIGINAL FOREST SETTING

It is a little more than three centuries since our ancestors crossed the stormy Atlantic, often taking many weeks of ocean travel before they could commence their settlements on the Atlantic border. At that time, the forests extended to the water's edge. I have taken great pleasure in visiting the historic spots along the Atlantic coast, among them Jamestown, where the English established their first permanent settlement in 1607. I have stood upon the very ground where those English pioneers are said to have landed. The settlers tried to find a place where the water was deep clear up to the bank, with strong trees close, so they could tie their ships when they were unloading their cargo. They found such conditions at the mouth of the James River and made their settlement at a place which became Jamestown. You can still see the original trees, or their successors, standing close to the water's edge. In memory you can see those brave men throwing the ropes around the trees that held their little vessels as their cargo was discharged.

America, at that time, was the most beautifully forested land on all this earth. Mile upon mile of white oak, black walnut, beech, and other valuable varieties were strewn with great profusion along the Atlantic coast, from the Gulf far into Canada. In the southland were beautiful forests of native woods. In the Mississippi Valley there were patches here and there of open prairie, but many of their farms our ancestors hewed out of the dense forests. The Great Plains, the short-grass country at the foot of the Rockies, the forested lands of the high altitude of the Continental Divide, and then the traveler to the West would enter the magnificent forests of the Pacific coast—such a heritage as was never before passed on to humankind. Think that those forests existed, almost in their virgin beauty, only a century ago!

It is true our ancestors along the Atlantic coast cut into the forests an average of about a mile a year, so when the Revolutionary War came, the Colonies had reached back in their roads and their cleared patches, about a hundred and fifty miles. There were a few primitive sawmills eating into what seemed inexhaustible forests—east of the Alleghanies.

#### THE KING'S SHIPMASTS

Historians of the colonial period state that, prior to the Revolutionary War, representatives of the governments of Europe realized the value of the straight, perfect pines of New England for shipmasts. For several years the shipmasts which supplied the warships of western Europe came out of New England, along with the planks that they used on the decks of those warships. That was a period of time when the wind and sails were the only means of propelling the ships of war which were, even then, trying to annihilate each other.

#### CIVIL LAW AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Coming out of Rome is what students know as the civil law. That system of legal procedure established a principle that no title could be given to any person or company for that which lay beneath the surface of the ground; hence, the coal beds, the ore, the iron, the oil, natural resources hidden beneath the surface of the earth were reserved for all the people wherever the civil law operated. No such resources were subject to private exploitation. It is for this reason that the Mexican Government refuses to recognize the claims of the foreign oil operators for the immense sums they demand as damages for being obliged to give up their oil reservoirs in Mexico. Had this wise law been extended at an earlier date to cover the forests of America, what a beautiful heritage it would have left to this generation and to those who are to come. I do not mean to prevent proper use of the forest but I do mean to protect young growth, harvesting trees as a crop, and not mining, wrecking, burning, and destroying the forests as private enterprise destroys them in greedy haste to pile up wealth.

#### PRIVATE EXPLOITATION

In the early days of this Republic, the greedy, selfish few whose minds were fixed on dividends and profits took advantage of the struggling government and acquired great areas of forested lands, starting in Maine, before the Revolutionary day, building on the inventive genius of America that seemed to spring into new life after this Government came into existence. After the American Revolution and up to World War No. 1 the timbermen tore, cut, and burned their way across the continent, through New England, the Lake States, through the Southland, into the Rocky Mountains, following the railroads. Yes; cutting, tearing to pieces, burning and destroying forests as they moved westward.

Now, into the Nation's last stand of virgin timber, in the Pacific Northwest, you can follow the path by the barren lands, the ghost towns, the stranded farmers. You can read in the literature of northern Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, the results of private destruction of the forests. Those miners, slaughterers, perhaps we ought to say "timbermen," took the cream of the forests, forcing their way over the mountains, driving abundant game before them, leaving perhaps along a public road a half mile of original trees, beyond which was mile upon mile of scarred mountain slopes, disfigured and ruined by erosion, often partly burned stumps. I must not forget

that a weak effort for reforestation was made here and there but the Joint Congressional Committee, of which I was a member, found that reforestation had not really taken a hold. Little evidence did that investigating committee find that there would be abundant wood supplies left for generations yet to come. The committee found that exploitation of the private forests was the general rule.

#### THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT MUST ACT

We have now reached a place where the Federal Government must take a hold, whatever be the cost and whatever be the necessary laws. We must pass into a period of Federal regulation and control, or we will pass into an age of scarcity of lumber instead of abundance—not only for future generations but the generation that is now coming onto the stage. Action can no longer be delayed if we are to enjoy forests in the United States.

#### PRIVATE OWNERSHIP IN TIMBER

Private ownership of large tracts of timber by absentee owners has been a primary factor in making it impossible to regulate cutting and insure reforestation. I am a firm believer in private enterprise, but not in water power, coal beds, oil reserves, or forests. In these natural resources, the whole community has a vested interest. The whole Nation has a stake in every forest and in every growing tree with the right to act for protection of its interest.

#### ENEMIES OF THE FOREST—FIRE

Fire is a great enemy of the forest. It is true that the pioneers in an early day often set fires for the purpose of cleaning up the underbrush so that they might see the Indians or that they might have a cleared patch on which to grow corn or pumpkins. Our investigating committee found that even now in the South the men owning cattle like to burn off the forests to get clean, green grass for their herds, forgetting the young trees that are often destroyed in such a fire. I have often heard the early pioneers say a fire is simply nature's method of cleaning up the back yard. Millions of trees have been destroyed by lightning. This destruction by nature can be greatly curtailed if active efforts are put forth to extinguish the fires.

Within recent years Federal and State Governments have established methods of preventing and controlling the forest fires. Three-fourths of the forest area today is protected. Watchers in towers erected at strategic points spot the starting of a fire and call upon the workers to extinguish it. Miles of telephone wires have been strung so that help and fire-fighting apparatus may be called. Airplanes have been brought into use, dropping men and food and fire-fighting apparatus close to the fire. Appropriations are entirely too meager even though the Congress has voted large sums for the purpose. The Joint Congressional Investigating Committee recommended that not to exceed \$10,000,000 a year be appropriated for fire protection and public control. This should be done without delay, but I would have the control exercised by the Federal Government.

The most disastrous forest fire of recent times occurred in Wisconsin at the same time Chicago burned, October 1871. Fifteen hundred people lost their lives in that fire, and more than a million acres were burned over. The disastrous Tillamook fire of 1933 in Oregon is treated in another speech I made on the 10th of December. It was preventable and caused by negligence of private operators. It destroyed \$200,000,000 worth of virgin timber.

#### FOREST DESTRUCTION BY INSECTS

Insects have destroyed millions of trees; they seem to thrive best on mature and unhealthy trees and during periods of great drought. When nature sends its insects, every effort should be made by man to counteract the resultant destruction as rapidly as possible. Appropriations by the Congress for insect control should be ample, so Federal officials can work with planned programs and efficiency, knowing they will not be hampered by lack of funds.

#### WE ARE A WOOD-USING PEOPLE

People in our country are naturally a wood-using people. We want wood to build our homes and other buildings, we want wood for fencing; we use wood in our industries. We burn wood for warmth. We have always had and enjoyed an abundance of wood. The early settlers, from ocean to ocean, when they went into a new country, first looked for two things in choosing a place of settlement—it must be in close proximity to wood and water. The research laboratories have now taught us how to use the waste wood—the small pieces—and this work must be furthered.

#### GROWING OF TREES IS A NATION'S JOB

The growing of most forests is a long-time job—often that of a lifetime, or even more. Forests occur in nearly all of our States. Every State and every person in every State has a vital interest in the forests of every other State. We have learned through long years of bitter experience that we cannot depend upon private owners to do the forest job that must be done in the public interest. It is equally true that we cannot depend upon separate action, or the lack of action, or the widely divergent action, of 48 different States.

The Federal Government, representing the whole Nation, must take the leadership in what is the Nation's job. More forest lands will have to come back into public ownership. The Federal Government must lead in bringing that about. Destruction of the forests on privately owned land must be stopped forthwith. Why delude ourselves into thinking that 48 States can or will do what no State ever has done, even as its forest wealth has disappeared? Only the Federal Government can carry out the whole forest program; it is emphatically the Nation's responsibility.

We shall have to have Federal leadership also if we are going to make real progress on the other measures which I have been discussing today; those measures which are included in the recommendations of the joint congressional committee.

#### ANNUAL HARVEST AND GROWTH

Although it is true that almost half of our commercial forest land is classified as saw timber, much of this has been culled over, or is small, second growth, and of inferior quality. One-sixth of the total commercial forest area is either barren of tree growth or so poorly restocked that it will not again without long delay produce a commercial crop.

The present timber resource of the United States is a little more than 500,000,000,000 cubic feet. To the annual cut of about 15,000,000,000 cubic feet, including both saw timber and cord wood, must be added 2,000,000,000 for destruction by fire, insects, and disease, so that the total annual drain on our forests is almost 17,000,000,000 cubic feet, or about one-thirtieth of the stand. Against this, current annual growth is estimated at about 11,000,000,000 cubic feet. The shortage in growth as compared to the drain is more marked for sawtimber alone, where the drain is almost double the growth. The discrepancy is still more marked when the element of quality is considered.

Lumber industry spokesmen have frequently cited mid-depression figures, with drain only 2,000,000,000 cubic feet in excess of annual growth, to show that there is no danger of a timber famine. We want to maintain activity in the forest industries at a higher level than prevailed in 1936, and we cannot do so if we continue to deplete the forest capital which is needed to produce usable growth. To balance our forest budget on a national scale without drastic curtailment of consumption of forest products, we must build up and maintain in all forested regions an adequate base of productive growing stock. Only in the Douglas fir and redwood forests of the Pacific Coast do we still have a reserve of virgin timber which may be reduced without an adverse effect upon future productivity.

The Joint Congressional Committee on Forestry, in its various meetings, encountered everywhere a demand for more money for fire protection. But the private commercial interests were not concerned about protection of the forests from destructive cutting. They demanded that the Federal Government should let them alone. They wanted no interference or regulation of cutting practices on their lands. At every meeting of timbermen this stand was reiterated.

#### ABUNDANCE VERSUS SCARCITY

Private interests which quote figures something like those in the preceding paragraphs evidently look forward to a day when timber will be scarce and prices high. The public is interested in an abundant supply and a reasonable price. The flaw in the reasoning of the commercial interests, as represented by highly financed lobbies in the Nation's Capital, is that the growth is not in saw timber. The saw timber is being exhausted at a very rapid rate. Even in the next 15 years many of the sawmills in Oregon will have to cease operations because they will have exhausted the

original or virgin growth, and all too little arrangement has been made to provide a second growth for future generations. The parting of the ways is right here. Following one road we will, as a Nation, increase only the values of private holdings and the riches of their owners. This road leads to scarcity in timber supplies, and much higher prices. We should start down the other road toward an abundant supply of timber at reasonable prices which people can afford to pay, with provision for permanent forests. In retiring from the Congress, I warn my colleagues that now is the time to act if they would preserve for future generations an abundant wood supply, such as we have previously enjoyed and which has been so ruthlessly destroyed.

#### NO TAX ON A GROWING FOREST CROP

I recall, when Governor of the State of Oregon, I announced in a discussion of the timber question that no tax should be levied on a growing forest. During the years that have elapsed since I made that statement, which raised a storm of protest in Oregon, I have become more convinced than ever that my original statement was right. To tax a forest, to tax a tree, means to hurry it on to the day when the woodman's ax will sever it from the ground, and it will move in to the commercial trade, even though often thrown on a glutted market. Who would think of taxing a growing crop of wheat or potatoes? Timber is certainly a crop and not a mine.

#### THE SEVERANCE TAX

When the tree crop is cut for market, then a tax should be levied, commensurate with the value of the crop that moves into the commercial channels. Owners of private timber will at once say, "For 40 years we have paid taxes on this crop and now you want to collect a severance tax in addition." Yes, commercial owners, and, until the new system is established, I am willing to make some reimbursement for the taxes that have been levied against your growing crop of timber. Introduction of this system would help to solve the problem of preventing forest destruction and, eventually, the severance tax would supplant other taxation of timber land.

#### CUT-OUT AND GET-OUT

I am unable to trace the origin of the well-known motto of private interests "Cut-out and get-out," but it has run through the beautiful forests from Maine to Oregon, and you can still see the effect of that practice, whether or not you can hear the resounding words as we did in former days. The words describe the attitude of some of the timbermen.

I remember hearing Forester Silcox tell a story of a mill that was cutting 50,000,000 feet a year and from their cutting circle could continue to cut that for all time. Then they decided to borrow a few million dollars, enlarge their operations and cut 150,000,000 feet a year and exhaust their virgin supply in about 15 years. Greed—the desire to get the benefit quickly, with no thought of the future. That has been the belief that



has gone through much of the commercial timber interests for more than a century. State or Nation should have stepped forward to put a stop to such a plan.

#### A SUSTAINED YIELD UNDER SELECTIVE LOGGING

By "sustained yield" we mean cutting from a forest, or from a cutting circle, only that amount of timber which growth will sustain and renew throughout the years. In October, I had the pleasure of driving through a forest in central Oregon where they were cutting only 20 percent or one-fifth of the ripest trees which were so large that the cut actually yielded 40 percent of the entire lumber supply on the land. I drove through miles of forests where such a cutting had been made 10 years before but it looked like a virgin forest. I have heard much about the reforestation by commercial timber owners. I have visited many of their forests, but I never saw anything comparable to the sustained yield cutting being done on the Federal forest reserve by the Hines Lumber Mill of Burns, Oregon.

#### CLEAN CUTTING

I am well aware of the fact that practical foresters have repeatedly stated that in the fir regions of western Oregon and Washington the plan of cutting only the ripe trees is not always practical, and that sometimes the Douglas-fir forests should be cut clean, and a new forest allowed to start, all at the same time. In some locations, however, the Douglas fir forests can be cut selectively, taking only the larger, older trees and leaving the younger, smaller trees for future growth. In other locations groups of the larger, more mature trees can be cut, leaving the smaller groups for future cuttings. Where clean cutting is necessary, it is always possible to leave patches of timber on the rough, rocky mountainsides, to scatter the seed for a new forest. When it is necessary to clean cut, the removal of the slashing and of the snags which abound in our Douglas-fir forests is absolutely necessary to protect the young forests from fire. Cutting is only half the job. It should be required that the area should be cleaned up to protect it against fires. Then if, for any reason, the young forest does not start, the clean-cut areas should be planted.

#### CUTTING AN UNRIPE TREE

I recall what a commotion I raised in a meeting of commercial timbermen by stating that I thought the time would come when it would be considered a misdemeanor to cut an unripe tree, even on a man's own land. My reasoning was that the entire community had a legitimate interest in the growing tree. Those who lived in the village, depending on the water supply of a creek for industry, those who wanted to enjoy the beauty of the tree, and those who looked to the future—all had a community interest in the tree and in the forest. It is a concern of society and its organized government to protect natural resources, and to guarantee their benefits to future generations.

#### PIONEERS SHOULD NOT BE BLAMED

I have heard many a pioneer say that if he had kept the hardwood grove which he found on his farm it would have been

worth more during his own lifetime than all the crops he had grown upon the land. Had that pioneer understood the reforestation problem and cut the ripe trees, he could have enjoyed a constant income therefrom and still be able to pass on to his descendants a beautiful and valuable heritage. In the early days it must have seemed as if the forests were inexhaustible.

#### IT IS LATER THAN YOU THINK

It is more than 60 years since I worked in a lumber mill in the mountains of Colorado. I have never lost my interest in the forest. It is my firm belief that "it is later than you think" for the preservation of our forests. One of the deep regrets I have in my closing days in the Congress of the United States is that I have not been able to do more to preserve the forests and to help create a sentiment in the National Capital which would curb destruction by the private interests and usher in the day of real forest conservation based on a guarantee of permanent abundance.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution and concurrent resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 170. Joint resolution extending until April 30, 1943, the period for which overtime rates of compensation may be paid under the acts of June 23, 1940 (54 Stat. 676), October 21, 1940 (54 Stat. 1205), and June 3, 1941 (55 Stat. 241), and for other purposes;

S. Con. Res. 41. Concurrent resolution providing for the sine die adjournment of the two Houses of Congress, and

S. Con. Res. 42. Concurrent resolution authorizing the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, notwithstanding the adjournment of the second session of the Seventy-seventh Congress, to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses of Congress which have been examined by the Committee on Enrolled Bills of each House and found truly enrolled.

The message also announced that the Senate requests the House of Representatives to return to the Senate the bill (H. R. 5444) to amend the act to regulate barbers in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, together with the Senate engrossed amendment thereto.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER] is recognized for 15 minutes.

#### WILL BUSINESS CONTINUE TO EXIST?

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, tragic as it may seem, during this period of war when the Government spending exceeds that of any other milestone in our Nation's history, the small and the average businessman in our country is gradually being forced to the wall. Quite recently a close survey has been made in the various localities in our Nation, and the result of that survey is alarming. It is quite alarming from the standpoint of business itself, and it is very alarming from the standpoint of our own Government. In the face of this impending disaster to business of every kind we are forced to the conclusion, that if and

when business is driven to the wall and our businessmen are forced to close their doors, that great source of revenue to our Government will be entirely cut off, and the means of prosecuting the war will be greatly diminished. With those businessmen engaged in operating their various businesses, many of whom have been engaged in business for many years and with a high degree of success, the Government had a source of revenue from the many and various taxes which were imposed upon them. Those people, when engaged in business and when they were prosperous, had the opportunity to buy War bonds, stamps, and to make their contributions for every worth-while and essential project to aid in the prosecution of the war. But when they are driven out of business—and that is the very thing that is now happening—the Government loses the taxes which have heretofore been collected, it loses the sales of bonds and stamps which it would otherwise be enabled to sell, and those people are prevented from making any contribution to the many and various agencies which are now aiding in our all-out war effort.

When we analyze this frightful situation, we are forced to the conclusion that such a policy, which is now enforced by those in command of our Government, is contrary to good business, and it is very obstructive and highly detrimental to our war effort. If our people are permitted to operate their businesses at a small profit, they are able to aid our Government, they are able to employ others, they are able to take their places among those who are aiding in our war effort. As one man, in the congressional district which I have the honor to represent, stated:

If we can earn money, then we can buy bonds.

Among this class of our businessmen who are being forced to the wall, we find the farmer, the merchant, the hardware dealers, the filling-station operator, the salesmen, the small-plant operator and the manufacturer, our banks and lending agencies, and practically every class of business within our country. When all kinds of business face disaster, then the workers are directly affected because when a business closes its doors the employees are left without a job.

Thus, this deplorable condition in which business finds itself at the moment, directly and indirectly affects a large part of our population. This is a very unhealthy condition in time of war, but it has been brought about by the bureaucracy which has been built by the administration now in power, and which has now reached the proportions of a supergovernment, manned by a group of agency heads who have been appointed by the President, but who were not elected by the people, and who could never be elected to any public office, and who are responsible to but one person—the President—who appointed them to their posts. Therefore, this frightful situation rests just where it belongs—on the doorstep of the President. He alone can alter this situation. He can save the businessmen of our country if he will act. That

action must come promptly and without any uncertainty.

In the analysis which has been made throughout the country, it is of interest to note the general trend of business in the various localities. I will include only a part of those localities herewith, but a number sufficient to give the general trend of business.

In Boston, Mass., the report shows that—

Vacancies in retail stores are increasing daily.

In Detroit, Mich., the analysis made shows—

Every tendency for commercial property rentals is downward.

Out in Cleveland, Ohio, the analyst gathers the following information:

Store rents definitely down, with a considerable increase in vacancies.

While in Chicago, Ill., the report comes—

That more vacancies are occurring in office and store properties, relieving all possible pressure to increase rentals. Trend for both is downward. Office space occupancy approximately 85 percent. Industrial space no longer demanding premium prices.

And going to St. Louis, Mo., which is in the great Central and Midwest, we find the following situation:

Survey showed 3,000 stores vacant. Store rentals stationary or decreasing. Comparatively large vacancies in smaller industrial properties with a tendency to decreasing rents.

Then going to the far West, we find the report from Seattle, Wash., which states:

Commercial vacancies, especially on the ground floor, are increasing. Office vacancies approximately 10 percent.

In Denver, Colo., the analysis shows—

Vacancies increasing and in office buildings the same is 10.8 percent, which is double what it was in 1937. Office building rentals 66½ percent of the level prevailing in 1928-29, with store rentals 25 percent below that level.

And selecting another centrally located city, we refer to the report from Indianapolis, the State capital of Indiana, which report reads:

Business buildings are 15 percent vacant, office space is 11 percent vacant, and vacancies are increasing rapidly.

We might pick out another city, and we will select Des Moines, Iowa, which is rather centrally located, and we find this report to be available to the public:

The number of vacancies in all types of property, except residential, is alarming.

Let us go to just one more city for information on this subject, and we will select Houston, Tex., and we find the report to be—

Trend of business and commercial rents steadily downward. Vacancies in office space and ground floor store space at least 15 percent.

We might take others. I think of one which I have before me. Madison, Wis.:

Vacancy in business property is the highest since 1933, and is steadily increasing.

Let us select another one from Oshkosh, Wis.:

Vacancies in the business section more than tripled in the last year.

Let us take Minneapolis, Minn.:

Vacancies on commercial and industrial space run from 8 to 40 percent. Vacancy on office-building space stands at 23 percent.

Dealing with this appalling situation may I say that I have a letter which came to my desk within the last few hours from the United States Wholesale Grocers Association, a corporation, with offices in Washington, D. C. I read the opening paragraph of that letter, in which that great organization makes this statement, which is alarming to the people of this country. I quote:

In 1 more year, or less, 50 percent of the wholesale and retail food distributors of the United States will be out of business if they must suffer a continuation of the Government's demand for reports, statements, inventories, and regulations, with which it has become physically impossible for them to comply.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I am interested in the discussion the gentleman is making about the occupancy of business properties. I have looked with misgiving upon the announcement by the Secretary of War that we, as a government, are to purchase the Stevens Hotel property in Chicago. I am wondering whether it is a good rule for the Government to go out and buy properties that are in financial difficulty, rather than be a renter during the prosecution of the war, and after the war is over have such properties belong to the Government of the United States. The reported purchase price of this property was \$6,000,000.

Mr. SPRINGER. I thank my distinguished friend for that splendid observation. May I say that I am in full accord with the gentleman's view on that particular subject. I do not think it is good business for the Government to buy a property, such as the Stevens Hotel in Chicago, Ill., paying huge sums of money for it, and go into business in competition with the private investors of this Nation. When the war is over our Government will have vast holdings in real estate upon which it will undoubtedly sustain terrific losses. This money should be used for our war effort—for planes, tanks, guns, and ships.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I hope the gentleman will give us some figures on the situation in Washington, D. C., the Capital of the United States.

Mr. SPRINGER. I am happy the gentleman mentioned that matter. In the newspaper article, of which this analysis was a part, reference is made to Washington, D. C., the Nation's Capital.

The heading of that article contains this outstanding statement:

Office space almost 100 percent filled in the District of Columbia.

Of course, in Washington where money is spent in huge sums, where a tremendous number of Government employees are spending all their earnings, and where the common people—the taxpayers—have been forgotten by a spending administration, business is considered to be on a high plane as compared with the small communities throughout the Nation. There is no depressed condition in Washington. Everything is filled to capacity, including business rooms and office space.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Referring to the letter the gentleman has just read from the Wholesale Grocers' Association, stating that perhaps 50 percent of the wholesalers and retailers of the country will have to go out of business within a year, it follows, then, that we must take one of two courses, either starvation or Government distribution of food?

Mr. SPRINGER. That is entirely correct. The gentleman has analyzed the situation in splendid fashion.

Mr. CURTIS. Is Government distribution of food, or socialism, necessary to win this war, in the opinion of the gentleman?

Mr. SPRINGER. It is not. The thing that must be done in this country is to permit our farmers to produce the food which is necessary for victory in this war, but at this very moment obstructions on every hand are being placed before the farmers, which prevent them from continuing the production of the volume of food which they could produce upon their lands.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. May I say that if the farmer is given an opportunity and permitted to have some farm help, and if his boys, who have been engaged in farming, are not taken away from the farm, but are permitted to remain thereon and produce food, the food will be produced which will be essential for a victory in this Nation. Our farmers need farm machinery and parts, much of which he is unable to obtain at the moment. The farmers want to produce, and they can and will produce the necessary food for victory if given a chance to do so.

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to my distinguished friend from Oregon.

Mr. PIERCE. I rather doubt that there is any obstruction anywhere today on the farmer producing. I just wonder



upon what grounds the gentleman makes these statements that they are still keeping the farmer from producing in quantity. It is not true in our State.

Mr. SPRINGER. May I say to the gentleman from Oregon that in my section of the country our newspapers are filled with sale advertisements, and practically all of those advertisements begin, "Because of having been inducted into the Army I am forced to hold this sale," or, "Because of my farm help being taken into the service, I am compelled to quit farming." The newspapers throughout my section of Indiana are filled with advertisements of that character.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes; I am happy to yield to my distinguished colleague from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I am sure that the gentleman from Oregon, as well as the gentleman from Indiana, has listened for some 2 or 3 weeks to the nightly broadcast of Mr. Fulton Lewis, Jr., in which he points out over the country that farming has been greatly handicapped by lack of tires and gasoline to operate the machinery on the farms.

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman is entirely correct. Now may I proceed to finish my statement?

Mr. PIERCE. I challenge the statement that there is a general effort today to stop production.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. There may not be any effort to stop it, but it is being stopped.

Mr. PIERCE. There is no question but that many of our farm boys have been taken into the service, but today they are being exempted if they ask for it.

Mr. SPRINGER. And may I say to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon that in my section farmers want to produce, they are trying to produce to the limit, but they are prevented from it by reason of priorities, by reason of regulations, by reason of their farm help being taken away from them, by reason of the farm boys, who have spent their lives on the farm, being inducted into the United States Army, and by reason of that fact the farm sales are made necessary because there is no adequate help to do the work. Oregon is certainly an exception, or the gentleman is unfamiliar with conditions.

Mr. Speaker, this is a frightful situation in our country. We are at war, and the people are bending their backs to aid in the winning of the war. They want to win this war as quickly and decisively as possible. They want to aid in wiping out the very last vestige of Hitlerism, and all that it implies. They want to aid in our all-out victory in this conflict. They will make any needed sacrifice in order that victory may come to our country—but they do not approve of rules, regulations, priorities, rationing, and other destructive orders which needlessly deprive them from participating in giving that aid to our country which they desire to render in time of war.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, our small businesses are suffering, and they are selling out their stocks and closing their doors. Many of these operators have passed the age in life at which they can hereafter rehabilitate themselves in business. Many of them have lost their life savings by reason of being forced out of business. This ruthless handling of the problem involved in our business world must be readjusted, and business must be restored and rehabilitated, and the life blood caused to again flow through the channels of business and trade in our country. This is highly essential now. Tomorrow will be too late to save many of them from disaster. The remedy would be simple, but it would be effective—the removal of many of the unnecessary rules and regulations which have been fastened upon them, and which now sucks the life blood from their business, would be very helpful; the removal of many of the nonessential priority rules and regulations would be stimulating, and the creation of confidence and the dispelling of fear would be the most helpful of all. Give small business a chance; stop obstructing its progress with untold and useless reports to the Government, and let our small business man go forward again in an effort to make his own way, unhampered and unfettered by governmental regimentation and domination.

Mr. Speaker, when our Government, and those in charge of the numerous agencies therein, again give business the "go sign," and stop meddling and obstructing those who form the very backbone of our Nation, we will find encouraging progress in the future. During this great emergency we cannot afford to hamper our businessmen. We must encourage them. We must grant them that God-given right to live and progress for the future.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under special order heretofore made, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] for 15 minutes.

#### CONDITIONS OF SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I shall take this time of the House to call attention to a problem that has occurred in my district, not because this one particular person is important in the affairs of the Nation, but because what is happening to him may be indicative of a widespread and broadening policy that means ruination to the backbone of our country. The little town of West Milton, in Miami County, Ohio, is located in a typical industrial and agricultural community of the Fourth Congressional District of Ohio, not unlike many of the other districts of the country, 50 percent farm population and 50 percent municipal and city population, lives a baker who has operated a bakery for some 17 years. In the early part of this month this baker wrote me a letter which I quote as follows:

Hon. ROBERT F. JONES,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I operate a bakery in West Milton, Ohio, and I have run out of sugar. The population of the town consists of almost all defense workers. This includes also the housewives. This fact makes the demand for my products very heavy, then also the bakery trucks which formerly ran routes through West Milton have discontinued their routes through this district. This fact is also very instrumental in raising the demand to even a higher standard.

Today I spent most of my afternoon and early evening in Dayton at the Office of Price Administration headquarters, trying to get an adjustment. I find that because I am in Miami County we are not entitled to extra sugar. Yet, Montgomery, Greene, Preble, and Hamilton are, because they are considered a defense area. Still we are under the rent control as a defense area.

Tomorrow I must close down my bakery until January sugar is issued. Now you know no one can keep from going broke under present conditions. I have labored here 17 years establishing my business and now to see it go out the window is more than I can take without a fight. I served 1 year in World War No. 1, and I have one son in the air service now. Another is to register in May and yet this is what is dished out to us in return.

I know Miami County is a Republican stronghold, thank God, but yet we are supposed to be united at this time of war. Truthfully I am more than willing to do anything to help in this war to bring our boys back home, but where is the justice in such rulings as put out by the Office of Price Administration?

No doubt you are a very busy man; your record has proven that. If you can be of any help in this matter, please advise and if you need more details, I will gladly furnish you with them.

Hoping for an early answer, and a favorable reply, I remain,

Very truly yours,

HARRY'S BAKERY.

WEST MILTON, OHIO.

P. S.—The people of this town are very much aroused in regard to this matter as I have the only bakery here, and it means a lot to them in packing lunches, etc. If it is within your power, investigate the ration board in Troy at your convenience. There has been very much criticism against them.

Mr. Speaker, I attempted to take the matter up with the Office of Price Control, and for several days I got the brush-off. I would get connected with the telephone line and then the line within the department would be busy. Finally, the latter part of the week, I got in touch with them. They told me that they looked up the list in their agency and they found no record in Miami County, in which this man's bakery is located, of an increase in population, although that whole county is teeming with war production. Several of the big businesses in that county have been awarded the Army and the Navy E. There is no doubt but what the population has increased. It can be proven in another agency of the Federal Government, because already additional housing has been granted by the National Housing Agency. Priorities are allowed and houses are now under construction.

In another town in Miami County the housing situation is critical, because war factories have made manpower demands,

sometimes as much as 300 percent more than a year ago. They have had to import them. In communities which are 50 percent industrial population and 50 percent country, naturally, they have to draw upon the people from the outlying smaller towns. That is what has happened in this case. In West Milton, Ohio, I am informed by this baker that nearly 80 percent of their people, both men and women, are in defense work. How does it affect the baking business of this little community when the women are working in defense plants? Naturally, they do not have time to bake; so they have to depend more and more upon this little bakery.

I talked to the Office of Price Administration, they say they will not consider it any further; they will not go into the matter; there is nothing that the man can do. He can close his doors and be damned until the 15th of December. He has been closed for almost 13 days now, because he could not get his January sugar until this date.

Mr. CURTIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. I am very much interested in what the gentleman is saying, because I have an identical situation in a defense county in my district, except that in this particular case the local rationing board offered some temporary help by giving them some extra sugar. This great omnipotent Office of Price Control in Washington has informed the lady that in addition to closing her business, when she does open up she has to pay back the extra sugar she has already gotten from the local board. It is outrageous.

Mr. JONES. I am very glad to have the gentleman's contribution, because anyone knows that a 17-year investment in a going concern can go down overnight when it is closed for one day. This man has been closed for 13 days. I said to the Office of Price Administration, "Can you not give him a temporary allotment?" And I was told by the O. P. A. that that would break down their entire system. I am glad to know that they did it in your case.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman misunderstood me. They did not do it. The local rationing board gave it to him and the Washington office says, "You cannot have it. You must pay it back out of your future allotment."

Mr. JONES. They did not grant my baker any additional sugar to pay back when they can review the population situation or his increased demand of 25 percent.

Mr. CURTIS. This individual is worse off than if he had not gotten a temporary order.

Mr. JONES. We passed a bill within the last few days attempting to curb the amount of questionnaires that must be answered. Here is the great Office of Price Administration that has had studies made on a score of questions. A man from one of the business organizations told me he had dug up out of his files of 5 years ago the same questionnaire that came from the Office of Price Administration lately. At that time, 5 years ago, it was to be used as a thesis

for this same gentleman, now employed in the Office of Price Administration, for his college degree. At that time business organizations did not have time to answer the questionnaires. Now they are forced to answer the whim of this employee, a former private citizen, a former student, attempting to better his own career.

The Government forces them now to answer the same questionnaires that probably have no more utility than they did 5 years ago. With all the questionnaires that are sent out, the Office of Price Administration at Washington does not know that in this same town where the bakery is closed the building-and-loan institutions' loans increased 25 percent; savings increased 30 percent; the post office shows money-order increases, 50 percent; postage and stamps, 27 percent; an increase in rural route boxes of 25 percent; gas connections, 20 percent. This man's bakery business has increased 25 percent. He has given me a log of what his business requirements were from January 1941 to December. He says, seriously enough, in his comment about reporting this schedule of sugar:

The only mistake I made was the fact that I told the truth.

I have a clipping from the November 20 issue of the Washington Times-Herald:

The small business outlook is grim, War Production Board declares.

Yes; it may be grim. Large contracts are handed out to the larger companies, and the O. P. A. runs the little ones out of business with rationing regulations. They draft questionnaires and cavort around the country to aid in their research, but they have a paralysis of analysis of the disaster they are spreading. To back up this statement that they have a paralysis of analysis, I have several letters from the Office of Price Administration with reference to gasoline rationing. Businessmen, who have salesmen on the road to deal with farmers, to help them raise food for freedom—food for victory—asked how much gas would be allowed for their salesmen to call upon the farmers. On December 3, 1942, the O. P. A. said:

We still have this problem under consideration.

Land of goshen! How long do they have to have a problem under consideration to find a formula? The gasoline-rationing problem in our section of the country is the same as it is in the East for we have about the same percentage of rural and city populations; just about the same problems come up; yet after 6 months they are still studying the problem. O. P. A.'s gasoline division are taking off these rural bakery routes and the sugar bureaucrats have now made it impossible for this baker to serve not only his former customers but the 25 percent increase that has been thrown upon him.

Some morning we shall wake up to find the entire rank and file of small business men in this country out of business and this source of revenue dried up if we permit the O. P. A. to continue its present policy of studying questionnaires, and coming to no conclusions. I sincerely hope something can be done

to save the backbone of our country, the small business man.

It may be we have passed through the era of experiment, through the heyday of the New Deal when we were going to save the little man. Do you remember how it was published in the newspapers that a humble colored man in the South, a sharecropper, was able to get the President of the United States on the phone to save his home? This problem is just as serious to the baker in my district as the sharecropper's problem was to him, yet I hesitate to bother the President of the United States, beset by manifold problems of winning the war as Commander in Chief. I think we have reached and are now passing through an era of new dealism that is really fanaticism on the part of these bureaucrats who are trying to make America over. It is nothing short of fanaticism; it is really a religion. They seem to feel that the Good Samaritan approach to the relief of trouble is too old-fashioned.

You remember the story, how the priest and the Levite passed up the man who lay wounded and beaten on the highway. The Good Samaritan came along, bound up his wounds, put him on his mule, took him to the inn, and provided for him until the Good Samaritan could come back and care for him. The new dealers seeing the wounded man on the highway declare an emergency, decide a spending project is the only thing that can help the dying man, investigate the feasibility, call in specialists, but instead of binding up the poor unfortunate one's wounds, they build a new stretch of highway under him.

If we as a Congress are going to neglect the cries of the little business men, of which this instance is one small example among many, many thousands of private enterprise shall fail entirely. I feel that the next Congress will not let these abuses go unheeded. The people will not stand for it.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

WE SHOULD ESTABLISH A NATIONAL COMMISSION FOR POST-WAR RECONSTRUCTION

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have this opportunity to express my hearty support of House Joint Resolution 291, to establish the National Commission for Post-War Reconstruction. I deeply regret that it is not being adopted before the adjournment of this Congress. It was my privilege to appear before the subcommittee of the Committee on Labor, when hearings were held on the original resolution introduced by the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] and state some of the reasons why I favored its adoption.

I consider it to be of the utmost importance that studies should be made and plans formulated now to deal with the problems which we know we are going to have to face when this war ends. Congress owes a duty to the American people to legislatively provide the legal machinery for this purpose. Our



post-war social problems are going to be tremendous and we should be studying the means and methods to meet them and solve them properly.

Our first duty, of course, is to the brave men and women who will return to civilian life when peace comes. They are entitled to immediate and remunerative employment and to enjoy the social benefits for which they have fought and sacrificed and risked their lives. If we as a Nation and Government fail in that duty, we will meet and doubtless be subjected to a national chastisement more humiliating and severe in its consequences than could have ever been inflicted by a foreign conqueror.

The maladjustments of family and community life, the dislocations to small business, the conversion of industry, all present problems which will be difficult but possible of solution if they receive sufficient study, consideration and planning while we still have the time to do so.

The resolution of the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] should have been adopted months ago and a national commission should now be holding hearings, taking testimony, and studying every phase of our post-war problems and formulating plans for the necessary course of action and procedure.

We have made many fine and noble promises to our own people and to the world in regard to the just social and economic order which we have pledged ourselves to inaugurate. We are not only committed, as I have indicated, to dealing resolutely and effectively with the post-war problems arising directly out of the present conflict but also we stand committed to doing something about the social and economic problems which vexed and plagued us before the outbreak of the war, which, indeed, contributed essentially to bringing on the war. We should also be studying these problems, such as the production and distribution of wealth, doing away with poverty, education and abolishing ignorance, monetary reform, and the underlying causes of social injustice and economic insecurity, the causes of war.

Are we going to let the Nation drift again after the war ends, or are we going to have the intelligence, moral courage, patriotism, vision, and Christian statesmanship to do something about these matters? If there ever was a time in our history and the history of the world when such a national commission, as is contemplated by the pending joint resolution, should be functioning, that time is now.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert as part of my remarks the statement which I made before the subcommittee of the Committee on Labor on June 30, 1941.

The statement is as follows:

ESTABLISHING THE POST-EMERGENCY ECONOMIC  
ADVISORY COMMISSION AND A NATIONAL  
UNEMPLOYMENT COMMISSION

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE  
COMMITTEE ON LABOR,

Washington, D. C., June 30, 1941.

The committee met at 10 a. m., Hon. ROBERT  
RAMSPECK (chairman) presiding.

Mr. RAMSPECK. The committee will be in  
order. We will hear first our colleague from  
the State of Washington, Mr. SMITH.

STATEMENT OF HON. MARTIN F. SMITH, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

Mr. SMITH. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I deeply appreciate this opportunity to appear before the committee. I desire to commend our colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] for presenting House Joint Resolution 76 to the House. I also desire to commend the Committee on Labor, and particularly this subcommittee, for conducting hearings on that resolution, which I think is of great importance and presents to Congress a subject which is certainly vital and ought to be acted on favorably. I have no prepared statement and will discuss this matter very informally.

For many years, even prior to the time I was elected to Congress, I have been interested in the subject of economics, and since I was elected to Congress, in 1932, I have tried to study that subject to as great an extent as time and my official duties permitted. I think I have read about every important book that has been written on the subject, and I have tried to read as many of the reports of committees of Congress bearing on the subject as time has permitted.

I think we all must be agreed that there is something radically wrong with our economic and social system. We find that it is the opinion of leading chemists, engineers, scientists, and inventors that we have in our country all the necessary raw materials; we have the skilled labor; we have the industrial plant; we have the transportation and communication systems; and we have everything that is necessary to provide all the people of our country with the basic necessities of life—food, clothing, and shelter; and yet in the midst of all this abundance and this plethora of everything that is required to make people comfortable and happy we find a condition of poverty, destitution, unemployment, and human misery which is absolutely appalling.

Our administration, of which I am happy and proud to be a part, has had to face this problem now for 9 years. Of course, it became acute several years before we came into power, and yet, much to our regret and chagrin and disappointment, I think we have not made any fundamental approach to the solution of these problems at all.

Here we find ourselves at the end of 9 years still having to conduct a Work Projects Administration program or a relief program.

I just want to cite a few statistics from reports of the Social Security Board on wages. For instance, in 1937, which was the highest wage year between 1929 and 1939, of the 30,000,000 wage earners in industry, commerce, and transportation, more than one-third had annual incomes of less than \$500; about 8,500,000 of these workers had an annual income of less than \$300. More than 14,500,000 had an income, an annual income, of less than \$700. Close to 19,000,000, or two-thirds of the workers, had annual wage earnings of less than \$1,000. These figures do not include domestic workers or agricultural workers, who are among the lowest paid in the country.

This means that two-thirds of our wage earners receive less than \$1,300, set as an absolute minimum by our Government for a family of four, a father, a mother, a boy of 13, and a girl of 8. The Heller Committee for Research in Social Economics, at the University of California, has set \$2,200 as a minimum for health and decency for a family of five. Ninety percent of our wage earners fall below this level.

Consequently, it must be obvious to us that there is something wrong with the distribution of earnings and wealth in this country when it can so truthfully be said that we have a few men with millions of dollars and millions of men without a dollar, and who apparently cannot find any opportunity to make a dollar.

It has never been my opinion that the Government owes anybody a living, but certainly the Government owes everybody an opportunity to make an honest living. Life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, which are the keystone in the temple of our Government, become a hollow mockery when so many millions—in fact, the great majority of the masses of the people of this country—apparently cannot even make a decent living and secure the fruits of their labor, which they are ready, able, and willing to perform.

Certainly, therefore, I agree that a committee of Congress should be appointed and empowered under the resolution introduced by the gentleman from California and by Senator WAGNER in the Senate, to conduct a thorough-going study and investigation of all these conditions which bear upon the economic life of the people of this country, and which will confront us whenever the present war ceases.

I hope in that connection that the committee, when it is appointed, will also study our banking and monetary system. We are agreed, and every fact indicates it, that we could produce easily not only what is necessary, but a surplus of the necessities of life—there could be a surplus provided. In fact, it is estimated by leading chemists, engineers, and economists of highest repute that we in the United States could by availing ourselves of the benefits of agricultural chemistry, feed the world. We could become the bread basket for the world, and we could spread a table for the entire human race so that they could have all the food that they require, from this country alone.

In fact, it has been estimated that in the State of Texas alone we could raise enough food to feed the entire United States of America. Yet we have right in the midst of that condition all this appalling unemployment and poverty and destitution and human misery.

It is a serious reflection upon every person who is connected with the Government, and certainly upon every Member of Congress, because we owe a duty which we must discharge to the people of this country. Therefore, I say there must also be something wrong with our banking and monetary system, because apparently we do not have a system under which we can distribute these foodstuffs and the goods which we can manufacture to the people of the country who are in need of them.

I view a monetary system as being merely a transportation system. You can also compare it with the use of the postage stamp. The purpose is delivery, to transport these articles, these products, to those in need of them. There, it seems to me, is where our monetary and banking system has broken down. We are agreed we can produce all these goods, and a surplus, and yet we do not seem to be able to get them into the hands of the people who are in desperate need of them. That largely must be the fault of the monetary and banking system. We are not succeeding in distributing what we are capable of producing.

It was my privilege on the 21st of May to take part in a seminar on the present relations between money and income which was held in New York City. The chairman was Senator JOSEPH O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming. I appeared as a member from the House. Other members of the panel were Mr. Stuart Chase, economist and writer; Dr. Noel Sargent, secretary of the National Association of Manufacturers; Dr. Murray Shields, economist for the Irving Trust Co.; Dr. Bradford Smith, economist for the United States Steel Corporation; and Prof. Ray Westerfield, of Yale University. We had a seminar which was supposed to last about an hour. We met at 2:30 and were supposed to conclude at 3:30. But we continued—we were so interested and absorbed—we continued until after 5 o'clock. We asked and answered questions regarding

the present relations between money and income, and that is one of the phases of our problem which I had in mind when I referred to our banking and monetary system.

I think that is one subject that we need to go to the bottom of, and it certainly would be a proper province of such a committee as the one contemplated by the resolution of the gentleman from California.

Then, in conclusion, may I suggest that it seems to me we are suffering also from a moral depression, a spiritual depression. I think the committee should give some study to that.

Dr. Frank N. D. Buchman, the founder of the moral rearmament movement, has said that we have enough for everybody's need but not enough for everybody's greed. I think it would be well for the committee to give some thought to the moral rearmament program. They have just issued a booklet, *You Can Defend America*. I want to commend it to the members of this committee, as I have to every other Member of the House and of the Senate.

We are certainly suffering from a spiritual depression in this country. Those few who have succeeded in getting control of the finances and the wealth of this country apparently fall in their obligation and in their duty to the masses of the people and are determined to get all of the profit that they possibly can exact from the people of the Nation. They need to get a different viewpoint, it seems to me.

The time is coming in our country when we are going to have to consider more the p-r-o-p-h-e-t-s instead of the p-r-o-f-i-t-s. That time is probably not far distant.

When you come to consider what we can do in this country to give employment, the Brookings Institution has estimated that the capital that could be required to make good the impairment of the heavy industries—that is, improvements that could be made and should be made in the industrial structure of the country—would be tremendous. We realize now, according to the estimates, that 40 percent of the employable people in this country, with the present machinery and plant that we have, could produce everything that is required, showing what a surplus of labor you are going to have and their scheme of further shortening the workday and workweek and retiring citizens past middle life. However, if we modernize, bring our machinery and industrial plant down to date, and take advantage of the discoveries and improvements that have been made available by engineers, inventors, and scientists in the past decade, then you could probably get along with about 25 percent of the available skilled labor in the country. It would cost between \$22,000,000,000 and \$26,000,000,000, according to the Brookings Institution, to bring that industrial plant down to date, the expenditure of which would involve a great deal of employment and use of materials of all kinds.

It seems to me we are on the threshold of Utopia if we avail ourselves of all the progress that has been made instead of continuing to deprive our people, the masses of our people, of these advantages and improvements through a short-sighted policy of pure selfishness and ignorance. It must be both. It must be selfishness and it must be ignorance. That reminds me of a little story—and, if I may, I shall conclude by telling this story, Mr. Chairman—of the experience of our colleague from Oklahoma, WILBURN CARTWRIGHT. The story has not been generally told, and perhaps some of you may not have heard it. A constituent of his came to Washington from one of his rural counties a few summers ago and spent about a week in the Capital. Of course, he had a great time and saw a great many interesting places. When he got home to Oklahoma, his friends asked him how he enjoyed his time here in Washing-

ton. Well, it was in the month of August, and during that time we all know about the humidity. The humidity here is very bad at that time. He had heard a good deal about it. Now, it happened that the old gentleman was a little deaf and so when they asked him how he enjoyed his trip to Washington he replied that he had had a fine time; he had seen a great many historic places, very inspiring and very interesting places; "but," he said, "the stupidity was awful." [Laughter.]

Now, I do not want to be quite as harsh as that; but I do think it is about time that we got down to the bottom of our problems and tried to find out what was wrong with our country and with our economic and social system and consider fundamentals instead of expedients and temporary palliatives.

I want to congratulate you, Mr. Chairman and members of this committee, because you have the courage and the foresight and are willing to sacrifice the time to undertake that important duty. I think it is very important, and I know you are going to have the cooperation and support of every Member of Congress.

Thank you very much.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Thank you, Mr. SMITH. Are there any questions?

Mr. LANDIS. I would like to know which of these resolutions you favor, 59 or 76? Do you have any preference?

Mr. SMITH. I have no particular preference. I thought they were almost identical. Of course I favor the one Mr. VOORHIS originally introduced. I think that is House Joint Resolution 59.

Mr. DAY. You mentioned House Joint Resolution 76 in the first part of your statement.

Mr. SMITH. As I stated at the outset, I am speaking extemporaneously and have no prepared statement. I may have inadvertently misspoken there. I should have referred to House Joint Resolution 59.

Mr. VOORHIS. The only difference is in the make-up of the commission, Mr. Smith.

Mr. SMITH. Yes.

Mr. KELLEY. I think what the gentleman had in mind was with reference to the size of the proposed commission. That is what we are interested in; that is, whether it should be a large or a small commission and what representation they should have on it. That is the thing we are trying to determine. The make-up of the commission is a very essential matter to decide, because on it may depend the efficiency of the work that may be accomplished. If it is too large it may be cumbersome.

Mr. SMITH. I would think that a rather small, compact commission would do a better job.

Mr. DAY. You appreciate that the element of credulity becomes important. What I mean is that the people feel that the Old Deal did not make good and the New Deal has not fulfilled so much of the promise, so that the element of credulity becomes a part in connection with this new plan.

Mr. SMITH. Yes. I do not think anybody has any one plan, because this whole matter has too many phases and ramifications to it. It is going to require, it seems to me, a thorough study and probing of our entire social and economic system, more or less. We are going to have to consider doing things which we have never done before. You are going to have the problem of trying to get the purchasing power into the hands of the people. We have the farm problem, which we have not solved. Then you have the matter of idle capital in this country. We are suffering not only from idle labor but from idle capital. You have to consider the investment field in that connection and what is wrong with it.

Finally, as I mentioned before, you have the banking and monetary system, which seems to have broken down completely, and is not performing the functions for which it

was originally designed at all, the movement of goods and services.

Whichever commission is appointed, they will have the biggest task to perform, it seems to me, that has ever faced any group of men in the history of the Congress, in order to do a thorough job. They ought to call before them, when they have their hearings, every person in the country who is an authority on any of these subjects, and particularly engineers, chemists, scientists, inventors, students of money and finance, as well as leaders of labor, agriculture, religion, and industry.

If the engineers, chemists, scientists, and inventors were consulted freely they could provide a superabundance, if they were permitted to do it, of the basic necessities of life—food, clothing, and shelter—for every man, woman, and child in America.

A group of scientists said not long ago that the countries of the world for instance—if you want to go outside of our own boundaries—could sustain in comfort and even luxury a population six times the present population of the earth. Yet, due to our blindness, we have wars raging in Europe because nations are fighting for what they call living room and because they cannot agree on the division of the natural resources and raw materials and are slaughtering the human race when there is no justification or excuse for it whatever.

If we could have cooperation among the nations, just as much as we need cooperation within our own country, these problems could be solved. Sometimes I wonder if Bernard Shaw was not right when he said that undoubtedly this planet was the insane asylum of the solar system.

Mr. CONNERY. In view of what you have said, that our whole economic system will have to be reconstructed following this present emergency—and I think we all agree on that—I was wondering why you would favor a small commission which might bring about a representation only of the so-called technocrats, and on which you would not get the representation of the various voices that should be heard throughout the country, such as industry and labor. I am referring to direct representation. Take labor, for instance. Of course, that is what I am wholeheartedly interested in.

Mr. SMITH. So am I.

Mr. CONNERY. Labor means the people.

Mr. SMITH. Absolutely, for they are the majority.

Mr. CONNERY. And if anybody should have a voice, they should have a voice on this commission.

Mr. SMITH. Yes; I mentioned that group first.

Mr. CONNERY. Of course, in the commission's dealings they will have to get the other side of the story, and there should be a direct representation from industry. Then it has been proposed here, and I think you will agree, that religion should be heard on this proposition.

Mr. SMITH. Yes; our religious leaders should analyze the economics of the Bible, which are practical but have not been applied as yet.

Mr. CONNERY. There has been too little religion.

Mr. SMITH. There has been entirely too little, and that is the main cause of all our troubles. We have been disregarding and violating the basic laws of the universe which are spiritual and moral.

Mr. CONNERY. Do you not think, in view of that, that a larger commission might be advisable in order that these voices might all be heard in direct representation rather than just being brought in to give testimony, and then made to step aside?

Mr. SMITH. It just occurs to me that it might be possible to have an advisory committee of a larger number representing every segment of our population.



Mr. LANDIS. Most of our witnesses have objected to that.

Mr. SMITH. Then to have a smaller working commission that would actually conduct the hearings, and would do most of the real work—the laborious work that would have to be done—the results of which, or the findings of which, could be submitted to this more numerous group for further study, analysis, and final conclusions and recommendations.

It has been my observation here in Congress and all through my life that if you want a job well done, you have got to centralize the responsibility and the performance of the task itself. If you have too many working at it, usually you do not get as good results. Is not that generally true?

Mr. CONNERY. I think that is true. But I feel that these voices that we have mentioned because they represent a majority of the people, should have direct representation on this commission.

Mr. SMITH. Yes. You should have labor, I would say, first of all; and you should have agriculture.

Mr. CONNERY. That is true.

Mr. SMITH. You should have industry and you should have science, religion, and finance.

Mr. CONNERY. Of course, if you have three Members from the House and three Members from the Senate, and six other members representing public groups, you are going to be in a difficult position to try to get representation for all of these various groups who should be heard, within the six remaining after you have appointed the three from the House and the three from the Senate.

Mr. SMITH. Your field is so vast, the field that you are going to have to consider, that it might be that a commission of 21 or 25 members might be necessary and advisable. Of course, if you did have that many, you could divide it up into subcommittees. That could be easily done, and it might be advisable for each subcommittee to consider certain specific problems, such as Mr. VOORHIS' unemployment conference of the House of Representatives, of which I have had the honor to be an active member in the last Congress and in this Congress. We have had the work subdivided and have considered 8 or 9 vital subjects by separate groups. Then afterward the smaller group reports to the full conference. Some such arrangement and division as that might be practicable.

Mr. CONNERY. That is the big question that we have here.

Mr. SMITH. I realize that is a question to which the committee will have to give a great deal of consideration.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Thank you, Mr. Smith.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert as part of my remarks a statement which I made before a subcommittee of the Committee on Labor on June 30, 1941.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNES] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HARNES. Mr. Speaker, I have been intensely interested in the discussions of my two distinguished colleagues, the gentleman from Indiana and the gentleman from Ohio, concerning the tragic situation facing the small businessman and small industry in this country. At intervals during the past 18 months I have urged this Congress to do something to alleviate this distressing situation. We, of course, recognize the fact that some of the things that have happened to small business and industry

are the inevitable result of war, but most of the things that have happened to destroy small business and industry are due to the bungling bureaucracy this Congress has permitted to exist in Washington during the past several years.

During the past months I have received hundreds of communications from business men and women in my district and State, but today I want to call this particular letter to your attention.

The letter is dated December 8, 1942, and reads as follows:

ANDERSON, IND., December 8, 1942.

DEAR Mr. HARNES: I just can't keep silent any longer. I am trying so hard to be 100 percent behind the war effort. I have one son in the service and another who will come under the 18-year-old draft. For that reason and countless others, we pray for speedy victory. In everything that we as a family do we are conscious that we are in war and have governed ourselves accordingly.

But here is the "hurt." Our auto agency, our only means of income for our family of six, was padlocked last January 1st. My husband being an aggressive person, immediately took stock of what remained of our little business to determine how he could make ends meet with big overhead expense, last year's taxes, a family to feed and educate, a home to finish paying for, etc., etc. The shop and small farm must then furnish our means of support.

For almost a year now the shop has been operating under great handicaps due to the fact that Delco-Remy and Guide Lamp factories are paying wages we cannot compete with. Some of the mechanics have preferred to remain with us, but the Selective Service has frightened them into going to the factory by threats. The above-mentioned factories have even come into the shop in person and hired the men. Therefore, a shortage of skilled auto mechanics has reduced the operation of the shop. I thought in a large industrial city your genuine auto repair shops were considered a vital and essential business. We are forced to turn the customers away daily because of shortage of help. Foreseeing he must do something further, my husband opened a semimachine shop. It took weeks of preparation, a lot of waiting for priority numbers to purchase machines and materials. He started with one "ace" operator and himself, this shop was opened in our former salesroom, and he was beginning to see the way, all parts made were accepted and orders for more are on file. Then the last straw came yesterday, Mr. HARNES, which prompts me to write you. The United States Employment Agency which came under Mr. McNutt December 7, forced this operator to leave my husband's machine shop to go to one of three factories here. He tried to explain to the board that what he was doing was as vital to defense as anything he could do in the factory. But the Board replied, "You go where we tell you or else we will put you where you won't want to go, and as for these little one-man businesses, they will all soon be out of business." For your information, the very employees that the factories have "drafted" from our repair shop have come back time and again and related how they stand around and do nothing all day. One man told me himself that our little 8-year-old could do all he had to do. Another said he didn't know what they called him for, he did nothing all evening but smoke and chat with others. Surely, Mr. HARNES, this isn't the way Mr. McNutt intends to distribute labor? Is the one-man business doomed? Will he lose all his investment in a modern, up-to-date auto agency and now his investment in machines and materials for which he has Government orders and can't operate? We are trying to squeeze a small profit out of a small farm on which he has

stock. But the rationing board has cut his allowance for gasoline in half.

He is now too discouraged to fight or care. All our years of work to establish some security seems to have been in vain.

Would you show my letter to Hon. McNutt. I am sure there are others who are under the dictatorship of such local agencies and I can't believe it is his policy.

Thanking you,

Mrs. D. J. MUNSON,  
Rural Route 2, Anderson, Ind.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HARNES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNES]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARNES. Mr. Speaker, this is just typical of the disasters that have overtaken and are overtaking thousands of small businessmen throughout the Nation. It is next in tragedy to this war and unless the next Congress does something to alleviate the suffering of these people, it indeed will be a national tragedy and a national disgrace.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNES. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Have we not enacted a small-business law and have we not appropriated some money to help the very conditions that the gentleman is speaking about? And may I say I am in full sympathy with the gentleman's views?

Mr. HARNES. Yes, but what can they do as long as you have a bureaucracy down here that is handling the manpower situation as they have so far handled it?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. How would the gentleman correct these conditions?

Mr. HARNES. By stopping these threats to employees, and by driving this administration to correct the inequities which are destroying small business. Also by exercising the constitutional authority entrusted to Congress to protect the American system of free enterprise from this increasingly dictatorial bureaucracy.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I think the gentleman should follow through with that.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNES. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Did you ever see any force imposed upon any one greater than that imposed upon Montgomery Ward & Co., demanding that they take on all the orders of the National Labor Relations Board?

Mr. HARNES. Of course, the entire Nation is amazed at such dictatorial, bureaucratic action on the part of this Government.

Mr. RICH. It is a shame and a disgrace to American liberty and American independence.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNES. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that

the gentleman may proceed for 1 additional minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. May I ask the gentleman this question: Is it not true that this is the first time when the President personally has indulged in the bureaucratic action to which the gentleman just referred in such scathing terms?

Mr. HARNESS. Of course, it is the first time I have ever seen or heard of such a thing happening. I shall comply with the request of this correspondent and send her letter to Mr. McNutt, and I believe the House will be interested in learning what action the War Manpower Commissioner will take to effect a solution to these problems.

[Here the gavel fell.]

#### ADJOURNMENT SINE DIE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I call up Senate Concurrent Resolution 41.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the two Houses of Congress shall adjourn on Wednesday, the 16th of December 1942, and that when they adjourn on said day, they stand adjourned sine die.*

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### RETURN OF H. R. 5444 TO SENATE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following request from the Senate, which was read:

*Ordered, That the Secretary be directed to request the House of Representatives to return to the Senate the bill (H. R. 5444) to amend the act to regulate barbers in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, together with the Senate engrossed amendment thereto.*

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the request will be complied with.

There was no objection.

#### SIGNING OF ENROLLED BILLS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 42), which was read:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That, notwithstanding the adjournment of the second session of the Seventy-seventh Congress, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives be, and they are hereby, authorized to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses which have been examined by the Committee on Enrolled Bills of each House and found truly enrolled.*

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. CARLSON asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.)

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address delivered by Harold Parsons at the celebration of the three hundredth anniversary of the city of Gloucester.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of tomorrow's RECORD and to include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

#### FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Gatling, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6386. An act to provide for an adjustment of salaries of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and the members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, to conform with the increased cost of living in the District of Columbia, and also to conform with wages paid in many cities of the Nation.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 6730. An act to protect the public health by the prevention of certain practices leading to dental disorders; and to prevent the circumvention of certain State or Territorial laws regulating the practice of dentistry; and

H. J. Res. 359. Joint resolution to amend Public Law 623, Seventy-seventh Congress, entitled "Joint resolution to codify and emphasize existing rules and customs pertaining to the display and use of the flag of the United States of America".

#### COMPENSATION OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 170, extending until April 30, 1943, the period for which overtime rates of compensation may be paid under the acts of June 28, 1940 (54 Stat. 676), October 21, 1940 (54 Stat. 1205), and June 3, 1941 (55 Stat. 241), and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

*Be it resolved, etc., That the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution extending the period for which overtime rates of compensation may be paid under certain acts," approved July 3, 1942, is amended by striking out "November 30, 1942," and inserting "April 30, 1943": Provided, That the authorization contained herein to pay overtime compensation to certain groups of employees is hereby extended, effective December 1, 1942, to all civilian employees in or under the United States Government, including Government-owned or controlled organizations (except employees in the legislative and judicial branches), and to those employees of the District of Columbia municipal government who occupy positions subject to the*

*Classification Act of 1923, as amended: Provided further, That such extension shall not apply to (a) those whose wages are fixed on a daily or hourly basis and adjusted from time to time in accordance with prevailing rates by wage boards or similar administrative authority serving the same purpose, (b) elected officials, (c) heads of departments, independent establishments and agencies, and (d) employees outside the continental limits of the United States, including Alaska, who are paid in accordance with local prevailing native wage rates for the area in which employed: Provided further, That overtime compensation authorized herein and under the Act approved February 10, 1942 (Public Law No. 450, 77th Cong.) and section 4 of the act approved May 2, 1941 (Public Law No. 46, 77th Cong.), as amended, shall be payable only on that part of an employee's basic compensation not in excess of \$2,900 per annum, and each such employee shall be paid only such overtime compensation or portion thereof as will not cause his aggregate compensation to exceed a rate of \$5,000 per annum: And provided further, That officers or employees whose compensation is based on mileage, postal receipts, fees, piecework, or other than a time-period basis or whose hours of duty are intermittent, irregular, or less than full time, substitute employees whose compensation is based upon a rate per hour or per day, and employees in or under the legislative and judicial branches, shall be paid additional compensation, in lieu of the overtime compensation authorized herein, amounting to 10 percent of so much of their earned basic compensation as is not in excess of a rate of \$2,900 per annum, and each such employee shall be paid only such additional compensation or portion thereof as will not cause his aggregate compensation to exceed a rate of \$5,000 per annum.*

Sec. 2. Within 30 days after the enactment of this act the heads of departments and agencies in the executive branch whose employees are affected by the provisions of this joint resolution, shall present to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget such information as he shall require for the purpose of justifying the number of employees in their respective departments or agencies. If any such department or agency fails to present such information or if, in the opinion of the Director, the information so presented fails to disclose that the number of such employees in any department or agency is necessary to the proper and efficient exercise of its functions, the personnel of such department or agency shall be reduced, upon the order of the Director, by such number as the Director finds to be in excess of the minimum requirements of such department or agency. Upon the expiration of 30 days from the date of issuance of such order by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget the provisions of the first section of this joint resolution shall cease to be applicable to the employees of the agency affected by such order, unless and until the head thereof has certified to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget that such order has been complied with. The Civil Service Commission is authorized to transfer to other departments or agencies any employees released pursuant to this section, whose services are needed in and can be effectively utilized by such other departments or agencies.

Sec. 3. The provisions of the Saturday half holiday law of March 3, 1931 (46 Stat. 1482; U. S. C. title 5, sec. 26 (a)), are hereby suspended for the period during which this joint resolution is in effect.

Sec. 4. This joint resolution shall take effect as of December 1, 1942, and shall terminate on April 30, 1943, or such earlier date as the Congress by concurrent resolution may prescribe.



Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, the House probably remembers that on two occasions we have by joint resolution extended the overtime pay for about 52 percent of the employees of the Government. The last extension expired on November 30, and we have been making an effort to work out the situation.

The present Senate joint resolution extends the overtime provisions which were in effect up to November 30. In addition, it extends the same privilege to other employees in the Government service who work on an hourly or weekly basis, putting them on the same basis as those who were under the resolution which expired on November 30. It pays, not time and a half but about time and a quarter. This is based on a computation of 306 days instead of 280, as it would be if you would base it on a straight 40-hour week. This means that those who would work 48 hours would get 21 percent, as I recall, in overtime pay; and if they would work 4 hours overtime, they would get about 10½ percent.

In addition, the bill provides for a 10-percent increase in pay for employees who do not work on an hourly basis, including the employees of the legislative and judicial branches of the Government. It includes all employees in the Capitol here. However, a limitation is involved both as to overtime and the 10 percent. It is payable only on the first \$2,900 of a person's pay. If a person gets \$3,000 a year, he gets the increase on \$2,900. Those who make more than \$5,000 do not get any increase or any overtime.

Briefly, that explains what this joint resolution does. It is limited to expire on April 30, 1943. It is hoped that the new Congress in the first 3 months of its life will work out this problem on a satisfactory basis.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I am interested in section 2 of this bill, and I shall read a portion of it to the House:

SEC. 2. Within 30 days after the enactment of this act the heads of departments and agencies in the executive branch whose employees are affected by the provisions of this joint resolution, shall present to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget such information as he shall require for the purpose of justifying the number of employees in their respective departments or agencies. If any such department or agency fails to present such information or if, in the opinion of the Director, the information so presented fails to disclose that the number of such employees in any department or agency is necessary to the prompt and efficient exercise of its functions, the personnel of such department or agency shall be reduced, upon the order of the Director, by such number as the Director finds to be in excess of the minimum requirements of such department or agency.

Then further on in this section we read:

The Civil Service Commission is authorized to transfer to other departments or agencies any employees released pursuant to this section, whose services are needed in and can be effectively utilized by such other departments or agencies.

I wish to ask whether the end to be sought here is to stop or slow down the employing of new personnel and try to make use of the excess employees for new positions that may be called for in the future? Is that the intention of this provision?

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is my understanding of it, and I may say to the gentleman from Ohio that I share what I think is his view, that we ought to take whatever method is possible to hold down the number of employees, and reduce that number in any case where it can be shown there is an excess. I think the purpose of the last sentence which the gentleman read is to give somebody authority, to transfer surplus employees, if there is found to be a surplus, to an agency that may be expanding. Of course, we will have some agencies in the future that may expand, necessarily so, but I think unquestionably that there has been some overstaffing in the hurry to expand these agencies for war purposes, and this is a good way, I think, to put a check on them, and give the Director of the Budget some authority and the Civil Service Commission some authority, to put that check on.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. The language of this section would indicate a clear recognition of the all-too-evident fact that there is overstaffing of Government personnel and that something should be done about it. Maybe this does not mean much but it at least indicates a sign pointing in the right direction and we ought to be glad even for that.

The whole country is aware of the enormous redundancy of persons on the Federal pay roll. I believe there are a million more persons on the Federal pay roll now than are necessary. I am convinced if that number were eliminated no harm would be done to the Federal services, but on the contrary they would be greatly improved.

It is my sincere hope that the next Congress will not hesitate to take drastic steps to bring about a substantial reduction in the number of persons now employed in the executive branch of the Government.

I am sure a great many Members would feel better in supporting this measure if we had more assurance that the greatly overstaffed agencies of the Federal Government would be reduced to a size consistent with real requirements.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I shall certainly cooperate with the gentleman in any way I can to remove from the pay roll any unneeded employees.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes more.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Let me ask the gentleman from Georgia about this matter. Nearly 60 days ago, or a little more than 60 days ago, the gentleman said that if we extended at that time the bill for 60 days

they would have a new bill in the House so that we would not inconvenience these employees. Why did we not have the bill brought in so that we could act on it in better manner than by unanimous consent today?

Mr. RAMSPECK. The only answer that I can give the gentleman is this. Another bill was worked out, and we expected it would come up in the other body about a month ago, but then the steering committee over there decided they would not let it come up. Another bill was worked out and reported and for some reason the Senate Civil Service Committee abandoned that and took this up. That is the only answer that I can give the gentleman.

Mr. RICH. If we extend this to April 30, 1943, is it reasonable to suppose that the committees, both in the House and in the Senate, will take action on this bill and get legislation that will be more permanent, so that the Government employees will know what is going to happen and the people of the country will know what is going to happen so far as the wages of these employees are concerned?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I think I can assure the gentleman, as far as the House committee is concerned, that we will make earnest effort to work out a reasonable solution of the matter between now and April 30, 1943.

Mr. RICH. There is one thing that I want to be sure of before we let the bill go through and that is that all Government employees who are now receiving time and a half or double time for any of their services are not going to benefit on that part of their labors on which they get time-and-a-half time and double time. Is this 10 percent going to be applied to those employees who are receiving time and a half or double time? If it is, we cannot let this go through, because that would not be right.

Mr. RAMSPECK. No; the 10 percent applies only to those people who do not benefit from the overtime.

Mr. RICH. I am very glad to hear that because I understood that was to be applicable to certain branches of the Government and not to others. It would not be fair, and we could not permit it to go through.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Frankly one of the things that has delayed this legislation is that there has been an effort upon the part of some employees of the Government to get both overtime and the 10 percent. That is not in the bill. They will get their overtime or the 10 percent.

Mr. RICH. Then I want to congratulate whatever Senator it was over there in the other body who brought that about, because whoever it was did the country a real service. Fifty-two percent of the Government employees are benefited here. Why could they not have made the benefit applicable to all Government employees?

Mr. RAMSPECK. This bill does make it applicable to all of them. It treats them all alike. All those who work on an hourly basis are put under the overtime provision until the 30th of April next and those who do not work on a weekly schedule are given the 10 percent.

Mr. RICH. One other statement I desire to make. No manufacturer in this country, no storekeeper or farmer or businessman can raise the wages of his employees without following out the Executive order made by the President setting up Jimmie Byrnes as a dictator of wages. Nobody can raise wages 1 penny without getting permission from Jimmie Byrnes.

This Congress gave that permission to the President and he in turn gave it to Judge Byrnes. Why is it that the Congress will not permit anybody else in the country to do that, yet you come in here with a bill and do the very thing that you refuse to permit the people of this country to do? Where is there any justice in that?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I think the justice for it is this, that these employees have had no pay raises, in most cases, since 1923 or 1925. Private employees, who are now being regulated by the act of Congress, have in most cases, at least, had pay increases within recent years.

Mr. RICH. Suppose there are those who did not receive pay increases?

Mr. KOPPELMANN. If the gentleman will yield, they are permitted to pay up to 15 percent over January 1, 1941—increase their pay.

Mr. RAMSPECK. As a matter of fact, in the law which we passed, to which the gentleman from Pennsylvania refers, and the power of which has been delegated more or less to Mr. Byrnes, it does permit increases, but only subject to the War Labor Board.

Mr. RICH. Yes; they have to approve it.

Mr. RAMSPECK. In other words, we did not put an absolute ceiling on wages.

Mr. RICH. Will Mr. Byrnes have to review this legislation and pass on it?

Mr. RAMSPECK. No, sir; he does not.

Mr. RICH. This is taking it out of his hands? In other words, this is the law when it passes the House?

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is my understanding. He has nothing to do with this.

Mr. RICH. Then if a Government employee who does not do greater piece work than someone in an industrial plant doing the same amount of work—work of a similar character—you take authority now to grant him a wage raise, but you refuse the manufacturer or the businessman the right to grant that wage to the individual whom he employs. It does not smack of justice to me. It does not sound good; but we are not going to argue that here now. I do not think it is sound legislation. We have had to do many things that I do not like.

Now, another thing, we passed the 40-hour week. We passed that for one purpose, and one purpose only, and that was to give more jobs to more people. Today we are at war, and in a terrible war. We need everything that we can produce, not only on the farms, but in our industries. Every man in this country ought to work to the limit of his ability if we are going to win the war. In the face of conditions like that, is this Congress going to go away from here today and say that we are going

to have a 40-hour week, when the men in the trenches are working 24 hours a day, and perhaps some of them 2 or 3 days at a time? That does not sound good to me. I hate like everything to go away from here saying that, but I do not want to block legislation that will do some good, because I think in 4 months you will do more good in trying to get this legislation made permanent than if we block it today and then try to do it within 2 or 3 weeks after we meet in January. I think I would be doing a greater injury to the Government if I did that than if I allowed this to go through. If it were not for that, this legislation would never get through in the world, because I would not stand for it. I hope that the gentleman from Georgia will get his Labor Committee to extend that 40-hour week. If you do not get some new blood on that Labor Committee you will not do anything, because the radical labor leaders of this country have the chairman of that Labor Committee and a good many others, and it is a terrible shame. But if you are going to be in war you ought to extend that labor week, I would say as a minimum, to 44 hours, and it should go to 48 hours. That should be the minimum. I hope the gentleman, for the good of the country and for the good of the men who are in the armed services, will give attention to that, and extend this 40-hour week to at least 48 hours.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I want to thank the gentleman for his cooperation.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. REES of Kansas. While I realize this is temporary legislation and will extend for only a few months, I think it is all wrong that this measure to adjust the pay of Federal employees should come up at the closing hours of Congress, when we have had months and months during which to work on this legislation. This legislation has not even been before the Civil Service Committee of the House for consideration. The unfortunate thing is that if defeated, several thousand employees will not even get their pay checks as in the past. Because of them, that part of the legislation should probably be adopted. It may be possible, of course, that the Congress, after deliberation, would favor this legislation, but I say again it is not right and not the way to do, to bring legislation of this kind before this House at its closing hours, and when only a few are present, and have it passed in this manner. I realize the legislation is temporary, but even at that, the method of handling it is not the kind that should be advocated by the leadership of this House, nor should such methods be approved by its membership, as I view it.

This legislation, even though it is temporary, should not be brought to the floor of the House in this manner. The gentleman from Georgia, Chairman of the Committee on Civil Service well understands that.

It should have been submitted to the Civil Service Committee and then

brought to the floor in regular order, so it could be properly debated and subjected to amendments.

It is just not right, regardless of the merits of the legislation, to bring up a measure of such importance in the last hours of the session, when only a few Members are present, and ask that it be passed.

Mr. RAMSPECK. That would be the much better procedure, and I am sorry we have to take it up this way. But may I call the gentleman's attention to this fact, that this resolution, as passed by the other body, is almost identical with the two bills on which our committee held hearings?

Mr. REES of Kansas. But that committee never recommended either of those bills for passage. The committee never even voted on them, as a matter of fact.

Mr. RAMSPECK. The gentleman is correct about that. I appreciate his point of view.

Mr. REES of Kansas. We are now dealing with this big subject affecting a million people in a very unsatisfactory way, when we could have handled it otherwise if we had got down to business and worked on it as could have been done.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I think it could have been done much better. I hope the gentleman will join me in the next Congress in helping to work this out in some satisfactory way.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I tried all last year to get something done, but we did not even hold hearings.

Mr. RAMSPECK. We will in the next Congress.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I think the questions and observations directed to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Civil Service are certainly indicative of the feeling in this body on both sides of the aisle, that there is an over-staffing of several agencies of Government during wartime, and also a certain inefficiency which has crept into these agencies themselves. As a member of the Civil Service Committee, I am ready to join in the inquiry we are shortly to undertake to secure the facts and then to correct evils that are found to exist.

I feel, however, that Members of this House today, by the passage of this legislation, at least will attempt in a certain measure to bring justice to efficient and necessary Government employees. Such action on our part has been long overdue.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield.

Mr. RIZLEY. Did I correctly understand from the gentleman's statements that this legislation will effect and does provide for legislative relief?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes; it includes the clerks in Members' offices—but not the Members of Congress, I may say to the gentleman.



Mr. RIZLEY. But it would apply to our secretaries?

Mr. RAMSPECK. It applies only up to \$2,900.

Mr. RIZLEY. But it applies to the secretaries and clerks in our offices.

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is correct.

Mr. RIZLEY. It does include postal employees?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes; it does include postal employees.

Mr. RIZLEY. Can the gentleman tell me approximately the number of employees who will be affected by this legislation?

Mr. RAMSPECK. It affects all the employees of the Government, it affects 2½ million people in one way or another.

Mr. RIZLEY. The gentleman means that this bill provides an increase for approximately 2½ million Government employees?

Mr. RAMSPECK. No; I would not say that, because some are going to take a decrease. Some have been getting overtime pay on salaries of seven, eight, and nine thousand dollars. We are going to cut that out.

Mr. RIZLEY. Can the gentleman tell me approximately the number of employees who will receive overtime pay under this legislation if we pass it today?

Mr. RAMSPECK. The gentleman means who have not received it heretofore?

Mr. RIZLEY. Yes; who have not heretofore received it, but who will be affected and will in the future receive overtime pay.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Fifty-two percent of the employees have been receiving overtime pay up to November 30. This brings the other 42 percent under the same provision, with the exception that those like rural letter carriers and certain other employees, including employees in the offices of Members and in the Capitol generally—except those under the Classification Act—who do not work on a weekly or hourly basis will get a 10-percent increase in their pay up to \$2,900. Just how many of that 42 percent are going to get the 10-percent increase and how many are going to get overtime, I cannot tell the gentleman.

Mr. RIZLEY. I am sure the able chairman of the committee can tell me the approximate amount in dollars and cents this legislation will cost the Government.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I do not believe I have those figures with me. I should say it would cost somewhere around \$250,000,000 on an annual basis. This bill, however, is for a 4 months' period only.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield.

Mr. PRIEST. In connection with the pay increase for postal employees, does this bill provide 10-percent payment on overtime for those employees who are now receiving compensatory time? There are certain groups of postal employees who work overtime but on a compensatory-time basis, rather than a monetary payment. Would this bill apply to that group?

Mr. RAMSPECK. It is my understanding that Saturday half holidays

are suspended and that they get overtime pay instead of compensatory time.

Mr. HARRIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS of Virginia. Are the custodial employees of the post offices included in this bill?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes.

Mr. HARRIS of Virginia. On an overtime basis of 10 percent?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I think on an overtime basis, because they work on a weekly or hourly basis.

Mr. HARRIS of Virginia. The spirit of this thing is that those employees who work overtime and are given compensatory time will now be given overtime, or 10 percent, instead of compensatory time off.

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is right.

Mr. HARRIS of Virginia. It includes all field employees as well as those in Washington?

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is correct.

Mr. HARNES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARNES. What effect does this bill have on an employee whose salary is \$5,000 or more?

Mr. RAMSPECK. He does not get any increase.

Mr. HARNES. The employee who gets \$2,900 a year receives a 10-percent increase if he is not on the overtime basis?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes.

Mr. HARNES. Suppose he gets \$3,000?

Mr. RAMSPECK. He will get an increase on the first \$2,900.

Mr. HARNES. Suppose he gets \$3,900?

Mr. RAMSPECK. He will get an increase on the first \$2,900.

Mr. HARNES. But if he receives \$5,000 he does not get any increase at all?

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is right.

Mr. HARNES. He does not even get an increase on the first \$2,900?

Mr. RAMSPECK. No.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. This is merely a stop-gap and the legislation will expire in April 1943?

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is correct.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman and the Civil Service Committee anticipate legislation when the new Congress convenes?

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is correct.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RICH. This is perhaps the last time I will ask this question. The gentleman says it is going to cost \$250,000,000 annually to put this into effect?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes.

Mr. RICH. I have asked practically every chairman of every committee in the House of Representatives the question, noting the fact that on December 11 the national debt was \$106,563,000,000 and that in February, or by February, Secretary Morgenthau states that they

are going to ask to raise the national debt to \$200,000,000,000. I am going to ask the gentleman this question, Where are you going to get the money?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I think that is a very pertinent question. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has served a good purpose by constantly repeating that question. I do not think I am as well qualified to answer it as the gentleman is himself. I am quite sure he knows better where we are going to get it, if we are going to get it, than I do.

Mr. RICH. If I were going to get it, I would get it, first, by trying to save on Government expenses. Next year, if there is anything I may say to the Congress, I would say that it might be well worth while trying your best to economize. That is the only way you are ever going to do it.

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is good advice.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF]?

There was no objection.

#### DISPLAY AND USE OF THE FLAG OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk House Joint Resolution 359, to amend Public Law 623, Seventy-seventh Congress, entitled "Joint resolution to codify and emphasize existing rules and customs pertaining to the display and use of the flag of the United States of America," with Senate amendment thereto and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That Public Law No. 623, approved June 22, 1942, entitled 'Joint resolution to codify and emphasize existing rules and customs pertaining to the display and use of the flag of the United States of America,' be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"That the following codification of existing rules and customs pertaining to the display and use of the flag of the United States of America be, and it is hereby, established for the use of such civilians or civilian groups or organizations as may not be required to conform with regulations promulgated by one or more executive departments of the Government of the United States.

"Sec. 2. (a) It is the universal custom to display the flag only from sunrise to sunset on buildings and on stationary flagstaffs in the open. However, the flag may be displayed at night upon special occasions when it is desired to produce a patriotic effect.

"(b) The flag should be hoisted briskly and lowered ceremoniously.

"(c) The flag should not be displayed on days when the weather is inclement,

"(d) The flag should be displayed on all days when the weather permits, especially on New Year's Day, January 1; Inauguration Day, January 20; Lincoln's Birthday, February 12; Washington's Birthday, February 22; Army Day, April 6; Easter Sunday (variable); Mother's Day, second Sunday in May; Memorial Day (half staff until noon), May 30; Flag Day, June 14; Independence Day, July 4; Labor Day, first Monday in September; Constitution Day, September 17; Columbus Day, October 12; Navy Day, October 27; Armistice Day, November 11; Thanksgiving Day, fourth Thursday in November; Christmas Day, December 25; such other days as may be proclaimed by the President of the United States; the birthdays of States (dates of admission); and on State holidays.

"(e) The flag should be displayed daily, weather permitting, on or near the main administration building of every public institution.

"(f) The flag should be displayed in or near every polling place on election days.

"(g) The flag should be displayed during school days in or near every schoolhouse.

"Sec. 3. That the flag, when carried in a procession with another flag or flags, should be either on the marching right; that is, the flag's own right, or, if there is a line of other flags, in front of the center of that line.

"(a) The flag should not be displayed on a float in a parade except from a staff, or as provided in subsection (i).

"(b) The flag should not be draped over the hood, top, sides, or back of a vehicle or of a railroad train or a boat. When the flag is displayed on a motorcar, the staff shall be fixed firmly to the chassis or clamped to the radiator cap.

"(c) No other flag or pennant should be placed above or, if on the same level, to the right of the flag of the United States of America, except during church services conducted by naval chaplains at sea, when the church pennant may be flown above the flag during church services for the personnel of the Navy.

"(d) The flag of the United States of America, when it is displayed with another flag against a wall from crossed staffs, should be on the right, the flag's own right, and its staff should be in front of the staff of the other flag.

"(e) The flag of the United States of America should be at the center and at the highest point of the group when a number of flags of States or localities or pennants of societies are grouped and displayed from staffs.

"(f) When flags of States, cities, or localities, or pennants of societies are flown on the same halyard with the flag of the United States, the latter should always be at the peak. When the flags are flown from adjacent staffs, the flag of the United States should be hoisted first and lowered last. No such flag or pennant may be placed above the flag of the United States or to the right of the flag of the United States.

"(g) When flags of two or more nations are displayed, they are to be flown from separate staffs of the same height. The flags should be of approximately equal size. International usage forbids the display of the flag of one nation above that of another nation in time of peace.

"(h) When the flag of the United States is displayed from a staff projecting horizontally or at an angle from the window sill, balcony, or front of a building, the union of the flag should be placed at the peak of the staff unless the flag is at half staff. When the flag is suspended over a sidewalk from a rope extending from a house to a pole at the edge of the sidewalk, the flag should be hoisted out, union first, from the building.

"(i) When the flag is displayed otherwise than by being flown from a staff, it should be displayed flat, whether indoors or out, or so suspended that its folds fall as free as though the flag were staffed.

"(j) When the flag is displayed over the middle of the street, it should be suspended vertically with the union to the north in an east and west street or to the east in a north and south street.

"(k) When used on a speaker's platform, the flag, if displayed flat, should be displayed above and behind the speaker. When displayed from a staff in a church or public auditorium, if it is displayed in the chancel of a church, or on the speaker's platform in a public auditorium, the flag should occupy the position of honor and be placed at the clergyman's or speaker's right as he faces the congregation or audience. Any other flag so displayed in the chancel or on the platform should be placed at the clergyman's or speaker's left as he faces the congregation or audience. But when the flag is displayed from a staff in a church or public auditorium elsewhere than in the chancel or on the platform it shall be placed in the position of honor at the right of the congregation or audience as they face the chancel or platform. Any other flag so displayed should be placed on the left of the congregation or audience as they face the chancel or platform.

"(l) The flag should form a distinctive feature of the ceremony of unveiling a statue or monument, but it should never be used as the covering for the statue or monument.

"(m) The flag, when flown at half staff, should be first hoisted to the peak for an instant and then lowered to the half-staff position. The flag should be again raised to the peak before it is lowered for the day. By "half staff" is meant lowering the flag to one-half the distance between the top and bottom of the staff. Crepe streamers may be affixed to spear heads or flagstaves in a parade only by order of the President of the United States.

"(n) When the flag is used to cover a casket, it should be so placed that the union is at the head and over the left shoulder. The flag should not be lowered into the grave or allowed to touch the ground.

"Sec. 4. That no disrespect should be shown to the flag of the United States of America, the flag should not be dipped to any person or thing. Regimental colors, State flags, and organization or institutional flags are to be dipped as a mark of honor.

"(a) The flag should never be displayed with the union down save as a signal of dire distress.

"(b) The flag should never touch anything beneath it, such as the ground, the floor, water, or merchandise.

"(c) The flag should never be carried flat or horizontally, but always aloft and free.

"(d) The flag should never be used as drapery of any sort whatsoever, never festooned, drawn back, nor up, in folds, but always allowed to fall free. Bunting of blue, white, and red, always arranged with the blue above, the white in the middle, and the red below, should be used for covering a speaker's desk, draping the front of a platform, and for decoration in general.

"(e) The flag should never be fastened, displayed, used, or stored in such a manner as will permit it to be easily torn, soiled, or damaged in any way.

"(f) The flag should never be used as a covering for a ceiling.

"(g) The flag should never have placed upon it, nor on any part of it, nor attached to it any mark, insignia, letter, word, figure, design, picture, or drawing of any nature.

"(h) The flag should never be used as a receptacle for receiving, holding, carrying, or delivering anything.

"(i) The flag should never be used for advertising purposes in any manner whatsoever. It should not be embroidered on such articles as cushions or handkerchiefs and the like, printed or otherwise impressed on paper napkins or boxes or anything that is designed for temporary use and discard; or used as any portion of a costume or athletic uniform.

Advertising signs should not be fastened to a staff or halyard from which the flag is flown.

"(j) The flag, when it is in such condition that it is no longer a fitting emblem for display, should be destroyed in a dignified way, preferably by burning.

"Sec. 5. That during the ceremony of hoisting or lowering the flag or when the flag is passing in a parade or in a review, all persons present should face the flag, stand at attention, and salute. Those present in uniform should render the military salute. When not in uniform, men should remove the headdress with the right hand holding it at the left shoulder, the hand being over the heart. Men without hats should salute in the same manner. Aliens should stand at attention. Women should salute by placing the right hand over the heart. The salute to the flag in the moving column should be rendered at the moment the flag passes.

"Sec. 6. That when the national anthem is played and the flag is not displayed, all present should stand and face toward the music. Those in uniform should salute at the first note of the anthem, retaining this position until the last note. All others should stand at attention, men removing the headdress. When the flag is displayed all present should face the flag and salute.

"Sec. 7. That the pledge of allegiance to the flag, "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one Nation indivisible, with liberty and justice for all," be rendered by standing with the right hand over the heart. However, civilians will always show full respect to the flag when the pledge is given by merely standing at attention, men removing the headdress. Persons in uniform shall render the military salute.

"Sec. 8. Any rule or custom pertaining to the display of the flag of the United States of America, set forth herein, may be altered, modified, or repealed, or additional rules with respect thereto may be prescribed, by the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, whenever he deems it to be appropriate or desirable; and any such alteration or additional rule shall be set forth in a proclamation."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Hobbs]?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand this involves no change in the law itself?

Mr. HOBBS. No change whatever. It simply puts the original act in its amended form, as the Public Printer desires it and as the Joint Committee on Printing must have it for printing under the rule. I am greatly indebted to Mr. Ansel Wold for calling this necessity to my attention, and to the Senate committee and the Senate for making the bill comply therewith.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, has there been an explanation made of this bill before?

Mr. HOBBS. Yes, sir; when it passed the House. The only thing in the world this does is to make two substantive amendments and several clerical amendments that correct verbiage or other mistakes. For instance, instead of using the term "hauling" the flag down, we substitute the word "lowering," and so on. This is a nonpenal act. These amendments were fully explained at the time the bill passed the House, and there has been no substantial change whatsoever in the bill as amended in the Senate. It was simply amended by setting



out the law at length with the amendments incorporated therein, rather than the way we did it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOEBS]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES AUTHORIZED TO MAKE INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the sine die adjournment of the House, special and standing Committees of the House authorized to make investigations may file their reports with the Speaker not later than noon, January 3, 1943, for printing as public documents.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

#### AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the sine die adjournment of the House the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

#### GENERAL EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House shall have the privilege, for 5 calendar days after the adjournment sine die, to extend and revise their own remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on more than one subject, if they so desire, and may also include therein such short quotations as may be necessary to explain or complete such extension of remarks; but this order shall not apply to any subject matter which may have occurred or to any speech delivered subsequent to the adjournment of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARNESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short poem.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

#### ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 194. An act for the relief of the Upham Telephone & Electric Co., Upham, N. Dak.;

H. R. 1646. An act for the relief of George Gels, and the administrator of the estate of Joseph Glaser, deceased;

H. R. 2894. An act for the relief of Mrs. William Butak, Dorothy Clyde, Mrs. Albert Westcott, Mrs. Albert Meyer, Florence Johnson, Marie Grill, Mrs. Leo Maloney, Marian McDonald, Mrs. Edward Beier, Mrs. E. L. Bly, Mrs. Lucien Miller, Lois Kehnl, Reka Berg, Mrs. Ollis Klicker, Wilma Vogler, and Mary Chisholm;

H. R. 2970. An act for the relief of Hiram Colwell;

H. R. 2973. An act for the relief of George O. Hanford;

H. R. 4029. An act for the relief of Catherine Barrett;

H. R. 4741. An act for the relief of the Midwest Oil Co.;

H. R. 4898. An act for the relief of Bothilda Stender;

H. R. 4918. An act for the relief of Anna J. Krogoll;

H. R. 5154. An act for the relief of the estate of Elmer White;

H. R. 5157. An act to reimburse F. E. Wester for labor and material used in the emergency construction of buildings and utilities at Civilian Conservation Corps Camp Escanaba;

H. R. 5175. An act for the relief of Edward Workman;

H. R. 5274. An act for the relief of Michael Leo Fitzpatrick;

H. R. 5409. An act for the relief of Gwendolyn Anne Olhava and Anthony L. Olhava;

H. R. 5486. An act to provide for means of egress for buildings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5649. An act for the relief of Alice Comas, Robert Comas, and Frances Williams;

H. R. 5812. An act for the relief of William E. Averitt;

H. R. 6095. An act for the relief of the estate of Mrs. H. L. Smith, deceased;

H. R. 6285. An act for the relief of Clarence A. Houser and his wife, Mrs. Jewel Houser;

H. R. 6366. An act for the relief of Alex Lawson;

H. R. 6370. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ching Shee (Ching Toy Wun);

H. R. 6489. An act for the relief of I. Arthur Kramer;

H. R. 6510. An act for the relief of L. H. Miller;

H. R. 6520. An act for the relief of Jane A. Thornton;

H. R. 6569. An act for the relief of William M. Miller;

H. R. 6653. An act for the relief of William R. Ivey;

H. R. 6677. An act for the relief of Ronald Leroy Chen;

H. R. 6895. An act for the relief of Mrs. Esther Mann;

H. R. 6749. An act for the relief of Mrs. Bessie Schakett;

H. R. 6771. An act for the relief of Lillian J. Delavergne and Myrla Delavergne;

H. R. 6780. An act for the relief of J. M. Jesse;

H. R. 6839. A act relating to the appointment and retirement in the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve of persons with physical disabilities, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6863. An act for the relief of Thomas W. Dowd;

H. R. 6873. An act for the relief of Maude Leach;

H. R. 6923. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ada F. Ogle;

H. R. 6924. An act for the relief of Joseph F. Gordon;

H. R. 7012. An act for the relief of Litchfield Bros., Aurora, N. C.;

H. R. 7035. An act for the relief of Mr. Garland Gailey, of Baldwin, Ga., and Mrs. Clara Mae Gailey, of Baldwin, Ga.;

H. R. 7167. An act for the relief of Elmore Lee Lane;

H. R. 7168. An act for the relief of Grover C. Wedgwood;

H. R. 7185. An act for the relief of Mrs. James Q. Mattox;

H. R. 7247. An act for the relief of Silas Frankel;

H. R. 7288. An act to relieve certain employees of the Veterans' Administration from financial liability for certain overpayments and allow such credit therefor as is necessary in the accounts of certain disbursing officers;

H. R. 7316. An act for the relief of Dr. J. M. Scott and Mrs. J. M. Scott;

H. R. 7333. An act for the relief of Arkansas Gazette, Hope Star, the Hope Journal, Arkansas Democrat Co.;

H. R. 7357. An act for the relief of Madeline Flori;

H. R. 7518. An act for the relief of Bernice Pyke, Arthur P. Fenton, Carl E. Moore, and Clifford W. Pollock;

H. R. 7522. An act to amend the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1943, so as to authorize the use of public-school buildings in the District of Columbia as and for day nurseries and nursery schools, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7587. An act for the relief of Etta A. Thompson, Marion E. Graham, Ruth Irene Morgan, and Alice K. Weber;

H. R. 7633. An act to increase the pay and allowances of the Army Nurse Corps, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7649. An act for the relief of Ralph B. Randall, rural rehabilitation supervisor, Farm Security Administration, Visalia, Calif.;

H. R. 7650. An act for the relief of Col. Leo A. Luttringer, United States property and disbursing officer for Pennsylvania;

H. R. 7651. An act for the relief of William F. Perkins, rural rehabilitation supervisor, Farm Security Administration, Pinal County, Ariz.;

H. R. 7652. An act for the relief of Warren M. Engstrand, grant supervisor, Farm Security Administration, Bakersfield, Calif.;

H. R. 7653. An act for the relief of Ensign Donald L. Grunsky;

H. R. 7705. An act for the relief of James E. Savage;

H. R. 7781. An act to define the real property exempt from taxation in the District of Columbia;

H. R. 7844. An act to amend sections 3, 4, 5, and 6 of the act approved March 7, 1942 (Public Law 490, 77th Cong.), providing for continuing pay and allowances of certain missing persons; and

H. J. Res. 365. Joint resolution to amend the Revenue Act of 1942.

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 2528. An act to provide for the settlement of certain claims of the Government of the United States on behalf of American nationals against the Government of Mexico; and

S. J. Res. 140. Joint resolution granting permission to Hugh S. Cumming, Surgeon General (retired) of the United States Public Health Service, to accept certain decorations bestowed upon him by the Republics of Colombia, Haiti, and Chile.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, December 16, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

# REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. JARMAN: Committee on Printing. House Resolution 576. Resolution authorizing the printing of "Questions and Answers on the Tax Bill"; without amendment (Rept. No. 2739). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. NICHOLS: Select Committee to Investigate Air Accidents. Report pursuant to House Resolutions 125 and 403, Seventy-seventh Congress. Resolutions concerning an accident which occurred on May 1, 1942, making an approach to the Salt Lake City, Utah, Airport; with amendment (Rept. No. 2740). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CLASON:

H. R. 7866. A bill to provide for the restoration to active duty and/or advancement in rank of certain World War veterans; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HARRIS of Virginia:

H. J. Res. 370. Joint resolution extending the period for which overtime rates of compensation may be paid under the act of June 28, 1940 (54 Stat. 676), October 21, 1940 (54 Stat. 1205), and June 3, 1941 (55 Stat. 241); to the Committee on the Civil Service.

## SENATE

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 16, 1942

(Legislative day of Monday, November 30, 1942)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, in this solemn hour fraught with a sense of finality we pause to praise the Power that hath made and preserved us a nation. As the sands of this year of peril, toil, and pain run low, we to whom has been entrusted the ministry of governance come with sobered hearts to write the final word in an epic chapter of our national history. Frail human hands have carried the precious ark of our heritage through the encircling gloom; yet we dare believe that Thy hand has been guiding and guarding.

We thank Thee that in the name of a free people ours has been the high privilege to sign anew the immortal Declaration crimsoned with the devotion of the founding fathers: "We mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor." Now, of the record made in this hallowed Chamber in months of destiny, we can but say, "What we have written, we have written." We ask the benediction of Thy grace upon all wise and good decisions and beseech Thee to forgive and overrule all that

denies. Thy will for us and mankind. As in the Name of the Lord our God we have set up our banners, we march on toward stern and bitter days with assurance that as we fight to make men free we march with Thee. Grant us wisdom, grant us courage, that we fail not man nor Thee. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, December 15, 1942, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

## ATTACK ON PEARL HARBOR—RESOLUTION BY NATIONAL CONGRESS OF THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a radiogram addressed to the President of the Senate embodying a resolution adopted by the Senate and Chamber of Deputies of the Dominican Republic, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Translation]

CUIDAD TRUJILLO, DOMINICAN REPUBLIC,  
December 7, 1942.

HON. HENRY A. WALLACE,  
President of the Senate of the  
United States of North America,  
Washington, D. C.:

The Senate and Chamber of Deputies of the Dominican Republic, meeting in joint session, has just carried out before diplomatic representatives of the friendly nations a resolution voted by the National Congress at the suggestion of the Honorable President of the Republic, Generalissimo Dr. Trujillo Milina, which reads as follows:

"Be it resolved, (1) To declare the 7th day of December of each year for the duration of the war in which the United Nations are now engaged as a day of reaffirmation of the solidarity of the Dominican Republic with the United States of North America, and (2) to hold a joint and solemn session of both chambers on the 7th of December of this year for the purpose of publicly consecrating this date and of confirming the faith of the Dominican people in the final victory of the United Nations." In uniting in this way the sentiments of the Dominican people with those of your great Nation in the remembrance of this sad date on which the peace of the continent was disturbed and the political, economic, and cultural life of the Americas threatened by the treacherous attack on Pearl Harbor by Japanese forces, we confirm the faith of the Republic in the victory of the United Nations, among which the noble Nation which you represent in Congress carries with glory and honor the watchword of continental solidarity.

PORFIRIO HERRERA,

President of the Senate.

MANUEL A. PENA BATLLE,

President of the Chamber of Deputies.

## PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR SALES AND SUPPRESSION OF VICE AROUND MILITARY CAMPS—LIST OF PETITIONS

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a list of petitions I have received in support of Senate bill 860 signed by an aggregate of 1,482 persons in 8 States.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Petitions received by Senator O'DANIEL in support of Senate bill 860—

Texas:	
Panola County.....	9
Montague County.....	400
City of Dilley.....	1
City of Ricardo.....	1
California: Los Angeles.....	46
Illinois: Lawrence County.....	98
New York: Rockland County.....	124
Ohio: Creston.....	12
Pennsylvania: Erie County.....	210
South Dakota: Sioux Falls.....	468
Washington: Seattle.....	113
8 States—total.....	1,482

## GOVERNMENTAL ECONOMY—RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY CONFERENCE OF AMERICAN SMALL BUSINESS ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution on the subject of governmental economy, which was adopted by the conference of American small business organizations at a meeting held at the Hotel Roosevelt, New York, on December 10, 1942.

In that connection, I invite attention to the fact that the organization highly commends two congressional committees, namely, the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, of which the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is chairman; and the subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee, which deals with the transfer of personnel and equipment, of which subcommittee the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] is chairman.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Congress has appropriated for the current fiscal year \$74,000,000,000 for prosecution of the war and \$6,000,000,000 for nonmilitary purposes; and

Whereas American taxpayers will be called upon to contribute approximately \$24,000,000,000 of this sum next year; and

Whereas this fiscal year the Government must borrow \$57,000,000,000, thereby raising the Federal public debt to \$147,000,000,000; and

Whereas in our opinion the American people will cheerfully contribute and pay any expenditure vital to victory but do not believe that waste and extravagance of manpower, service, enterprise, and Federal funds should be condoned by the Congress or the executive branch of our Government; and

Whereas the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Expenditures has declared the "surface of economy has only been scratched" in Washington: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Conference of American Small Business Organizations endorse the official economy effort of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures headed by Senator HARRY FLOOD BYRD, of Virginia, and the Committee on Transfer of Employees, headed by Senator MILLARD TYDINGS, of Maryland; and that the chairman of this conference be, and he is hereby, directed to communicate with the President of the United States, members of the Cabinet, Members of Congress, sending them a copy of this resolution, and urge and demand that all items not absolutely essential be eliminated from the 1944 Federal Budget.